

LB
230
.A87

JUL 1921

Proceedings

OF THE

THIRTY-FOURTH ANNUAL
CONVENTION

OF THE

Association of
**Colleges and Preparatory
Schools**

in the Middle States and
Maryland

1920

HELD UNDER THE AUSPICES OF

The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

FRIDAY AND SATURDAY

NOVEMBER 26 and 27, 1920

PUBLISHED BY THE ASSOCIATION

1921

NOTICE

Extra copies of the Proceedings of the Association may be secured without charge from the Secretary by any officer of a College or School holding membership in the Association.

A charge of twenty-five cents per copy is made to those not members of the Association.

The next Convention of the Association will be held at Swarthmore College, on the Friday and Saturday following Thanksgiving, 1921.

Proceedings
OF THE
THIRTY-FOURTH ANNUAL
CONVENTION
OF THE
Association of
Colleges and Preparatory
Schools
in the Middle States and
Maryland

1920

HELD UNDER THE AUSPICES OF
The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

FRIDAY AND SATURDAY
NOVEMBER 26 and 27, 1920

PUBLISHED BY THE ASSOCIATION
1921

CONTENTS

	PAGE.
Officers of the Association.....	4
Commissions Under Auspices of the Association.....	5
Constitution of the Association.....	7
Morale in the Secondary School: Its Enemies and Its Allies.	
<i>Ella Lyman Cabot</i>	10
Can Character be Taught and Measured?.....	
<i>Thomas H. Briggs</i>	22
Discussion	
<i>Eugene R. Smith</i>	31
<i>Olive Ely Hart</i>	34
<i>Eugene C. Alder</i>	35
<i>Richard Mott Gummere</i>	37
Temporary Committee	39
Business Meeting	40
Report of the Treasurer.....	40
Report of the Auditing Committee.....	41
Report of the Executive Committee and Appointments.....	41
Report of the Committee on Accredited Schools.....	42
Report of the Commission on Higher Institutions.....	44
New Business	45
GENERAL TOPICS—What Are the Minimum Standards to be	
Demanded of a College Before Admitting Its Graduates	
to the Professional Schools?.....	48
<i>Frank Goodnow</i>	48
<i>William Mikell</i>	53
<i>L. C. Hunt</i>	54
General Discussion	64
List of Members 1920-21	67
Delegates Registered, Convention of 1920.....	71

OFFICERS OF THE ASSOCIATION, 1920-21

President

President WILLIAM WESTLEY GUTH, Goucher College.

Vice Presidents

Chancellor JOHN G. BOWMAN, University of Pittsburgh.

Chancellor ELMER E. BROWN, New York University.

Mrs. SARAH WOODMAN PAUL, Kent Place School.

Headmaster JOHN D. SKILTON, Tower Hill School.

Dean W. A. WILBUR, George Washington University.

Secretary

Professor GEORGE WM. MCCLELLAND, University of Pennsylvania.

Treasurer

Principal STANLEY R. YARNALL, Germantown Friends' School.

Executive Committee

Mr. WALTER R. MARSH, St. Paul's School, Garden City.

Miss OLIVE ELY HART, South Philadelphia High School for Girls.

Dean HERBERT E. HAWKES, Columbia College.

Professor JESSE H. HOLMES, Swarthmore College.

COMMISSIONS UNDER AUSPICES OF THE ASSOCIATION

COMMISSION ON HIGHER INSTITUTIONS:

Terms expiring in 1921: Dean JOHN H. LATANE, Johns Hopkins University; Professor GEORGE GAILEY CHAMBERS, University of Pennsylvania; Principal A. ALVIN SNOOK, Frankford High School; DR. J. GEORGE BECHT, Assistant Commissioner of Education for Pennsylvania.

Terms expiring in 1921: Professor ADAM LEROY JONES, Columbia University, Chairman; MR. WILSON FARRAND, Newark Academy; Professor LUTHER P. EISENHARDT, Princeton University; DR. A. S. DOWNING,, New York State Department of Education.

Terms expiring in 1923: President FREDERICK C. FERRY, Hamilton College; Dean W. W. ALEXANDER, Swarthmore College; DR. GEORGE A. REAVIS, Maryland State Department of Education; MR. WALTER R. MARSH, St. Paul's School.

The President of the Association.

The Secretary of the Association.

COMMISSION ON ACCREDITED SCHOOLS.

Terms expiring 1921: MISS MIRIAM A. BYTEL, St. Mary's School; MR. SAMUEL M. NORTH, Maryland State Department of Education.

Terms expiring 1922: President JOHN H. DENBIGH, Packer Institute; Professor RADCLIFFE HEERMANCE, Princeton University.

Terms expiring 1923: Headmaster WILLIAM M. IRVINE, Mercersburg Academy; Professor GEO. GAILEY CHAMBERS, University of Pennsylvania, Chairman.

The President of the Association.

The Secretary of the Association.

CONSTITUTION
OF THE
ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES AND PREPARATORY
SCHOOLS IN THE MIDDLE STATES AND MARYLAND

[Reprinted by Request]

Article 1

NAME AND OBJECT

§ 1 The name of this association shall be the ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES AND PREPARATORY SCHOOLS IN THE MIDDLE STATES AND MARYLAND.

§ 2. The object of the association shall be to consider the qualifications for candidates for admission to college and the methods of admission; the character of the preparatory schools; the courses of study to be pursued in the colleges and schools, including their order, number, etc.; the relative number of required and elective studies in the various classes; the kind and character of degrees conferred; methods of organization, government, etc.; the relations of the colleges to the state and to the general educational system of the state and country; and any and all other questions affecting the welfare of the colleges and schools, or calculated to secure their proper advancement.

Article 2

MEMBERSHIP AND VOTING

§ 1 Any college, normal or high school, or other school preparing students for college, in the Middle States and Maryland, may be received into membership in this association upon approval of the executive committee.

§ 2 In transacting the ordinary business of the meetings of the association all delegates present shall be entitled to vote, but on all questions requiring a decision *by ballot* each institution represented shall have but one vote.

Article 3

OFFICERS

The officers of the association shall be president, one vice-president from each state represented in the association, a secretary, a treasurer, and an executive committee of four members, together with the president, secretary and treasurer, who shall be *ex officio* members of the executive committee. These officers shall be chosen at the annual meeting, by ballot, and shall hold office for one year, or until their successors have been elected. The executive committee shall elect its own chairman.

Article 4

DUTIES OF OFFICERS

§ 1. The president, or in his absence a vice-president, shall preside at all meetings of the association, and sign all orders upon the treasurer.

§ 2. The secretary shall keep a record of all business transacted by the association and conduct the necessary correspondence.

§ 3. The treasurer shall receive and hold all moneys of the association and pay out the same upon a written order of the president.

§ 4. The executive committee shall prepare business for the association, fix time of the annual meeting, call special meetings, and act for the association in its recess; but the acts of this committee shall always be subject to the approval of the association.

Article 5

MEETINGS

There shall be one annual meeting of the association, for the election of officers and the transaction of other business. Unless determined by the association the date and place of holding this meeting shall be decided by the executive committee, which committee shall also have power to call special meetings of the association.

Article 6

EXPENSES

To defray the expenses of holding the meetings of the association, conducting the correspondence, printing, etc., the sum of \$7.50 shall be assessed upon each of the institutions represented in the association, and any deficiency which may occur shall be provided for by special action of the association.

Article 7

POWER OF THE ASSOCIATION

Decisions by the association, of questions not pertaining to its organization, shall always be considered *advisory*, and not *mandatory*, each institution preserving its own individuality and liberty of action upon all other subjects considered.

Article 8

RELIGIOUS TESTS

No religious tests shall be imposed in deciding upon membership or other privileges in this association.

Article 9

A QUORUM

Representatives from one-third of the institutions belonging to the association shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business.

Article 10

CHANGE OF THE CONSTITUTION

This constitution may be altered or amended at any regular meeting by a vote, by ballot, of two-thirds of the institutions represented at said meeting.

MORNING SESSION

MORALE IN THE SECONDARY SCHOOL: ITS ENEMIES AND ITS ALLIES

MRS. ELLA LYMAN CABOT, Boston, Mass.

Have you ever met, as you have walked along country ways or past a suburban corner where four roads meet, a group of boys and girls from fifteen to nineteen, the sight of whom haunted you for days afterwards through the look of irresponsibility, vulgarity and vapidty which was in their faces?

The boys will probably be smoking cigarettes, slinging stones and slang at one another, jeering at a passer-by, and "fooling"—appropriate word!—with the girls. And the girls, what do they look like? Well, as near to moving-picture show girls as they can, giggling and simpering with their rouged lips, verging toward the clown with their powdered faces, and their eyebrows reduced as nearly as possible to a single thread.

Some people are afraid of ghosts, but this sight is to me far more haunting. Ghosts are but shadows of the past. This sight terrifies me because it is more like a hideous mask worn at Hallowe'en to cover a face that might be beautiful. I believe the ultimate unveiled standards of boys and girls are high, and it is to try to uncover and to keep uncovered the real face behind these strange masks that I have written this paper.

The enemies of morale, shown even in the brief glimpse that we have as we pass such boys and girls as I have described, are three: (1) the influence of the gang spirit, (2) early love, (3) lack of any responsibility in life. I believe that by understanding the psychology of this age we can help to transform these enemies into allies. Therefore I shall begin by analyzing the gang.

(1) During the years from eleven to about sixteen the gang is to the fore. It is indeed so powerful that J. Adams Puffer, who knows it well, concludes: "For certain purposes at this stage we may ignore the boy and attend to the boy-group. After sixteen the group dissolves and once more we may take up the education of the individual."*

*J. ADAMS PUFFER, *The Boy and His Gang*, p. 18.

Now the gang may at any moment develop as an enemy to morale. Here is a description from Puffer of a typical gang of the rougher sort:

"Twelve boys: four Irish, three French, two Poles, two Germans, one Jew. Ages between twelve and eighteen, but generally about fifteen. The boy who told me the story, one of the Frenchmen, said with much pride, 'We never get caught stealing.' I have since watched boys stealing from the big markets; they certainly have reduced it to a science!

"Met on L. Street; all lived on that street. Would not let any gang on that street. Give a strange boy a licking. M. was ringleader—steals most; says 'Come on'; biggest and oldest. Didn't let anybody in after we started; been going together five years. M. started it, and asked us to be in the gang. We played run-sheep-run, tag, relieve, hide and seek. Stay out all night; have a fire down by the foundry. Go to shows Monday and Saturday nights; like Railroad Jack, Great White Diamond, White Eagle; like plays where there was fighting. Jumped freights. Ran away from home to U——; stayed up there two weeks. Hated to go to school; ran away because I didn't like to study. Saw boys out, so I liked to stay out and play baseball. Go to W—— Market in a crowd; steal apples, candy, grapes and peanuts; we never get caught. Put wires across the sidewalks. Fight with another gang; fought for the fun of it, to see which was the strongest; fought with clubs. If there was a dispute in our crowd, leader settled it. If two fellows were fighting for a thing, the leader took it away from them and gave it to another fellow. If a member of the gang lied to one of us fellows, we called him a squealer; if he told on us, we called him a spy. Get our money from junk. Drink beer. All smoke. We had our best times bunking out, ringing doorbells, and tying cats' tails together. We like to plague girls—ask them for a kiss, and things like that."

This description from the lips of a boy of fifteen confirms, does it not, the picture I have painted of lack of morale. If then the gang leader is adverse to the school he can pull down standards of behavior much faster than the school can build them up. The weak leader lets the reins slip. We "descend to meet" is the much-quoted remark of Emerson. Yet it is but half true.

We descend or we rise according to the control of a master-mind or the slackness of a degenerate one. The boy leader, weak and popular, who calls out, on a hard hike, "I say, fellows, let's quit," pulls down the gang. So does a drifting leader who uses his money or influence to draw the crowd into gambling or low movies.

Naturally the standards of the gang leader when they are low tend to pull down the weaker members. I recall a group of five boys and girls of about fifteen years, quite unchaperoned, frolicking one wintry Sunday afternoon in that dangerous part of the city belonging to millionaires. The girls came back to supper flushed and excited. "Oh, yes, they'd had a wonderful time." But as "wonderful" is the only adjective known to youth, I wondered, too. At bedtime my special child, Helen, murmured that it was awfully hard to keep up your standards when the girls all smoked cigarettes and rough-housed with the boys, sprawling all over the floor. She had been shocked and, in spite of hating to be called a prig, she had refused rough-housing and cigarettes. Nellie and Juliet, her special friends, had gone the whole length, but Juliet was much nicer than Nellie, the girl confided, for Juliet was really ashamed and sorry afterwards. Besides, Juliet went into it for the sport, while Nellie only did everything that the others did without enjoying it. I told Helen that I thought the boys whom she wanted to know and who were worth knowing, would like her better and respect her more if she stuck to her principles. She agreed. "The two boys who didn't smoke looked really shocked to see the girls do it."

Girls' gangs are not any more than those of the boys, always of a high character. When I asked in my psychology class for a list of the clubs that the members had belonged to in earlier years, one girl said very gently: "I am afraid you will be shocked, Mrs. Cabot, but we had a club called Raise the Devil Club. Its main rule was that you should always do something worse the next week than you had done the week before."

This gang spirit then is often one of the enemies of morale. The gang spirit attains its height, according to Puffer, Lee and Sheldon, at about fourteen. By sixteen boys and girls are beginning to be far more interested in one another than in their gang.

(2) Early love is a subject that is often ignored (at least in

the school curriculum!) and yet we cannot teach well unless we know to whom we are speaking. Where are the thoughts of the boys and girls who sit so passively in rows before us? If you should shout, "Where are you at this moment?" and they were startled into answering truthfully, they would be often far away, dreaming of someone who is not the teacher and of some subject that is not what you are teaching. Unless you remember vividly your own callow youth or know boys and girls so intimately that they confide in you, it is hard to allow enough for the all-invading presence of romance. Here is an extract from a letter written by her sister of fifteen that a girl gave me to read:

"Are there any masculines at New Atlantic? If there are be sure to write me all about them. I went to a dance last Tuesday and Charlie was there. I hate him—but I wouldn't hate him if I wasn't perfectly sure he dislikes me. He said good-night to Laura and said he hoped he would see her in New York, but he did not say good-night to me at all. I'm so jealous of Laura. It's awful to have somebody liked better than you are. One of the boys I like at dancing-school is awfully unpopular," she went on. "It's good fun to like an unpopular boy. He dances atrociously; you have to skate round to avoid hitting his feet. I didn't like him much till one day he told me about wanting to go in for aviation. He hopes the war will last till he has a chance. Of course he wants it to end, you know, but he wants to be in it. There's another boy I just despise. He is very common and he says, 'Hello, Sally,' in an amorous tone."

Here is another account of a "crush" written later, but interesting as showing the complex psychology in the love of a girl for a much older woman.

"When I was fifteen I formed a 'grand passion' for a woman many years my senior. To her I poured out the short story of my life, my aspirations, my gloomy forebodings and my fascinatingly interesting speculations on life, death, birth, marriage and the futility of existence. My motto at this time was, 'Mine be some figured flame which blends, transcends them all.' (I did not always think life futile!) Miss Jackson introduced me to birds and my adoration for her extended itself to her feathered friends. We really had heavenly times when we went birding. I remember with peculiar pleasure still the afternoon we first saw the scarlet

tanager, sitting on a bush full of small new leaves and splashed with sunshine.

"Curiously enough, deep inside of me, sturdily suppressed and never faced, I felt a slight contempt for her. In our family we have always laughed at one another, never unkindly, I think, but each have idiosyncrasies and foibles, amusing to ourselves and to the other members. My palm-leaf crosses, my dramatic school circulars, my doglike devotion to Miss Jackson and my 'soul' were made sport of so cleverly that I really thought them rather diverting, too, and made fun of myself even though I repented it later in anguished hours. I felt (this quite unacknowledged) that Miss Jackson shouldn't take me so seriously as she did. This could hardly have been more unreasonable since to have my long-winded confession taken seriously was precisely what I wanted. Later I found her total lack of humor less and less tolerable for an idol, so I removed the pedestal and on her two feet on terra firma she was very nice.

"At about sixteen I changed a great deal. My moods were less tumultuous and exhausting. I gave up my long reveries and hours and hours with books, and I enjoyed the companionship of my contemporaries more and more. "Thank God, that is over," said my father reverently."

Well, that is one solution—to wait impatiently as one waits for the end of a play one is bored by. But surely we can find better solutions than this.

The third powerful enemy to morale at this secondary school period is an indifference to study that is closely connected to irresponsibility in life. The high school age has indeed its strong attachment to the gang, its shifting attachment to the other sex, but very little attachment to most of the studies we are trying faithfully to teach.

The other day in looking over the note books of my class in ethics I ran up against the following note which I soon saw with amazing relief had not been written in, or about, my class:

"Dear Polly—I am writing on queer paper, but you see I am in class and the old lady is talking about Current Events. I don't understand a word. I never did care about reading anything in the newspapers except the comic sheet.

"Are you going to the Yale game? Is Bob going to take you?

Well, now I've got to stop. I guess I'd better kid the teacher along a little and make her think I'm interested. Your devoted,
"DOROTHY."

Here we have a complete and light-hearted indifference to the curriculum. But worse than indifference to the curriculum is a kind of aloofness from widely recognized moral standards that is startling.

Three boys in a class were found to have exactly the same entirely erroneous facts on their history examination paper. The teacher referred the case first to a wise friend of his who had long been dean of a college of boys. He answered decisively that the case ought to be reported, even though it would probably result in the boys being expelled. But the teacher had a small council of boys whom he trusted and he called them in for advice, asking them what he should do. He was amazed at their answer. They thought it would be enough if he put a short note at the end of each paper, implying that the answers were too much alike. But what startled the teacher most was this comment:

"I don't think the boys knew you would mind. They will stop if they think you do not *like* it."

This answer, reducing the sin of cheating to something the instructor may like or not like opens a vista of difference in moral standard that we may do well to look down. "They cheated because they did not know you would mind!" That reminds me of the girl in my ethics class, a Kentucky girl by the name of Norah. She came up to me most genially the other day after handing in a paper where, like Shakespeare, she had spelled the same word in different ways on different pages, and remarked pleasantly, "You mustn't mind the way I spell, Mrs. Cabot, because I always do it that way." This was comparatively a non-moral situation. But cheating is a different matter. It seems impossible for anyone of the high school age to take it as a matter merely of taste on the part of the instructor. Yet when I put the situation of the three boys to my own class of girls who were studying the nature of wrongdoing, some of them, too, replied very hotly that it was not the boys' fault, that the standard in most high schools was so low that cheating was practically exonerated. They also added that they thought a great part of cheating was due to the evil influence of the marking system, and this in two ways: that

it made an oversharpest distinction between pupils of equal faithfulness but different ability, and that it overaccented marks instead of accenting an interest in the study itself. I was surprised to find out how hotly a number of girls maintained that you could get much good from a study in which your marks were persistently low.

How shall we treat, then, from point of view of morale, this high-school period when the gang influence is strong, when boys and girls are more concerned with one another than with their work, when the interests of life have not begun to hold them to responsibility?

Diagnosis is easier than treatment. Reformers like physicians tend to linger on the interesting disease. I have warned myself not to do this. Therefore I will try in the remaining time to suggest what may be done by personal interest as well as by better teaching, to increase the moral standards of the secondary schools.

First, we must get what one of my wise friends calls the inside point of view. We must see the boys and girls of this age as they see themselves. Mr. Henry Endicott cleverly illustrated this effective inside point of view in a speech some two years ago on the relations of labor and capital.

"In a country town there was a mule which was a great favorite. The children and grown people were both very fond of that mule. One day 'Billie' was lost, and there was a great commotion. They hunted everywhere for that mule and did not find him. Up to noon they hunted, without result. Finally a farmer who lived about six miles out of town came in and asked, 'What is going on? Is it a holiday?'

" 'No, Billie is lost.'

" 'Can't you find him?'

" 'No, we can't.'

"The farmer went off, was gone half an hour, and came back with Billie.

" 'How did you find Billie?'

" 'Why,' was the reply, 'I just thought like a mule, and then I walked straight to him.' "

Even a mule appreciates having his thoughts understood, and at the other extreme from a dull mule, so do boys and girls bewildered by new experiences and emotions long to be under-

stood. To get the inside point of view is entirely to drop one's irritation, for irritation is an unmistakable symptom of the outside point of view. I do not mean that we should never condemn. On the contrary, condemnation is often an inside point of view. It may bring to light what is dimly known by those who are doing wrong. Condemnation that grows out of sympathy may be of untold value in clearing up a murky situation.

Tout comprendre c'est tout pardonner. True, but pardon is not enough. Really to understand would be not merely to pardon, but to transform enemies into allies. Therefore, I believe that since the gang is the central social unit at this period it should as far as possible be helped by being broadened and recognized as an early beginning of the spirit that is in all membership.

The spirit of membership may become the greatest single religious experience of man. To be united for any stirring cause is to feel one's self not artificially soldered to the group, but a branch of it—growing with its growth. And to know yourself as a twig on the branch is to feel the vine, the roots that are yours, yet greater than yours. I know no better analysis of the value of this spirit of membership as felt by the gang than is given in Joseph Lee's "Play and Education." He portrays membership not as the act of helping one another; but as working through a common soul; not as losing one's self, but as finding the team; not of shrinking because one is only one among many, but of enlarging because one belongs.

What is true of making the best of the gang is true in a different way of early romance. Difficult as it is to deal with, it means an awakened life, and, though it is often morbid, foolish and ridiculous, that is not all it is. Behind the foolishness something else peers shyly forth—a love that is ready for absolute devotion—and whenever there is good imprisoned it can be released.

In my own classes on social ethics and human relations I have found it perfectly possible to discuss hero-worship and to get from the class itself enlightening answers to the question, What are the characteristics of real hero-worship as distinguished from flimsy substitutes?

That leads me to speak of the attempt I have made to help the morale of the secondary school by courses dealing directly with

everyday problems of ethics and with human relationships. I consider my position as a teacher of these subjects in the school curriculum like that of the missing link. I think of myself as a string holding together the pearls of all the other subjects. Ethics ought to be the subject that unites other subjects, that helps the class to see their school life as a whole. I begin my course by explaining that ethics is the study of right choosing and well doing,—not of being good but of being good for something and of making good. I tell my classes that in the course of our discussions of ethics every topic in the world is open to us, for there is a right and a wrong equally about hunting big game or keeping a secret, cooking mince pies or running a railroad. After they are once clear what the field of ethics is I have often found it wise to ask each member of the class to hand in a list of at least two ethical questions that she would really like to have discussed. Here are some of the questions that were handed in this year:

Is it really right for women to smoke?

How far ought one to lie as a hostess in order to be polite?

Has prohibition helped the country?

Should one girl report another who has done wrong?

Is modern dancing corrupting the morals of Americans?

Is Thomas Mott Osborne's theory of the treatment of prisoners a good one?

If you love an unworthy person, should you continue or drop the friendship?

Should immigration be limited?

Obviously these questions lead to a wide variety of subjects, and in one of the first lessons I group and classify these topics, and, what is far more important, try to lead back from the special instance to the principle behind it. The subject of whether one ought to tell on a friend who has done wrong, for example, reaches out into the whole rich field of justice, of imagination and of loyalty. Almost all girls will start with the idea that it would be disloyal to tell on a friend, but are largely unaware of the deeper loyalty of converting a friend who is doing wrong, and very slightly aware of the need of loyalty to the whole school.

Now I think of the class in ethics or social civics as one aiming at fairness, clearness and thoroughness of thought on problems of right and wrong and, therefore, as a place in which such

subjects as cheating, which upset the morale of all the school, can be talked through in an open and co-operative way. To make this point clearer, let me illustrate by a talk that as it happened, occurred just as I was leaving Boston to come to this meeting.

A college boy, exceptionally high-minded and clear-minded, was taking supper with Dr. Cabot and me.

Said he quite casually: "Oh! I must not forget to take Tom's seat in English B tomorrow at 9 A. M. so that he will be counted as present. He is passing the week-end in New York, and Harvard puts a boy on probation if he is not present at the first recitation after Thanksgiving."

We protested at Tom's cheating and at Harry's connivance. Harry was genuinely startled. It was from his point of view an act of pure kindness. He didn't want to get up early and go to a course that he didn't belong to. He thought Tom was justified in going. His parents had telegraphed him to come to New York for the week-end. They, too, apparently were oblivious of the rule. We pressed the point further. "If you are in Tom's seat the proctor will count him present. But suppose the proctor saw you were not Tom. What then?" "Oh!" Harry answered blithely, "the proctor wouldn't mind. He might even arrange it for you beforehand if you asked him to count you present even when your seat was empty."

Our protests grew louder. A proctor engaged by the college cheating? It was abominable. "Why, no!" said Harry, quite surprised, "It is a rotten rule that you have to be back after Thanksgiving instead of having the week-end, and probation is much too severe a penalty."

Then, as he saw we disagreed, he said: "I don't like to be doing what you disapprove. Do you really think it wrong for me to take Tom's seat and answer to his name tomorrow?"

"Why surely, where is it leading? Would you disguise yourself to look like Tom. Doesn't that lead out of the practice?"

"Yes," he admitted, "Tom said he would have asked Ned, and not troubled me, except that Ned has black hair and Tom sandy, so he couldn't."

"And, then, a sandy-haired boy might make money off it," I said.

"Yes, it has come to that, too. One boy will give another a

tennis racket he wants, or let him off paying a \$2.00 debt for sitting in his seat."

"Close to bribery, isn't it?"

Harry saw this was bad as a custom, but maintained that he himself was only helping a friend in difficulty. ("I wouldn't ask anyone to do it for me;—at least I never have," he said.)

"But if you were recognized by the proctor as taking Tom's seat wouldn't you feel sneaky?" we asked.

"Oh, no!"—quickly—then with unusual truthfulness—"that is, I wouldn't let myself feel sneaky. It's a bad way to feel. If the professor was cross and crabbed, I shouldn't care at all, but if he was nice about it and seemed sorry, then I should mind. But," he added, "the rule is bum and the office that makes the ruling is bum. The penalty for taking a cut after vacation is too severe and there is almost no one I know who wouldn't break it."

Here is one of the finest college boys I know conniving at cheating though I am perfectly sure he could be made to appreciate and respect the laws of the college if they were thoroughly understood by him. It is not only a boy like this who will work against principles or authorities he does not understand. It is true also of teachers.

Last winter I met a Massachusetts High School teacher of a vigorous, alert type. She taught in a mixed high school and spoke to me about the difficulty of note-passing in school. "The trouble is when you punish anyone, you usually get the wrong person," she said. "I called down a boy last week whom I had seen taking a note and asked him to hand it over to me. He refused. I told him to leave the room. As he went, I followed him. 'Why did you refuse?'

"'A girl wrote it and I wouldn't think of giving it up.' 'All right,' said the teacher. 'Throw it in the fire here. I don't want to see it,' and she shook hands with him.

"Of course we are supposed to report such cases to the superintendent," she added; "but I never do. He is too severe."

I have meant, in these examples, to show that twisted like a tangled skein in the minds of students are motives good and bad,—motives more often than not due to *confused thinking* and unthought out loyalties and disloyalties. I believe that the whole morale of the Secondary School can be greatly helped if the

teachers learn to see the students as they see themselves, and if the students learn to see the masters and the school in their deepest aims. I believe this can best be accomplished in the following ways, which, for convenience of discussion, I have put in these propositions:

1. We ought to start early in each year with an account, just as vivid and appealing as we can make it, of what the school is trying to do.

2. I believe that each teacher should speak one by one at a meeting of the class or school and show what his or her course stands for and, if possible, how it is related to the other courses.

3. I believe there should be some pledge (possibly voluntary) of allegiance to the school.

4. There should be more explanation of the reasons for all school rules.

5. There should be a course, called Ethics, or some equivalent name, in which questions of right and wrong, of loyalty, fair play, honor, obedience, discipline, truth, friendship, can be impersonally and thoroughly discussed.

I want enlightenment if I am mistaken on these points. I throw them out for discussion. If not, why not?

CAN CHARACTER BE TAUGHT AND MEASURED?*

PROFESSOR THOMAS H. BRIGGS, TEACHERS' COLLEGE, COLUMBIA
UNIVERSITY.

Of one sort or another character has always among all people been the theoretical prime object of secondary education. Primitive man laid his emphasis on adjusting "the individual to his material and immaterial environment through established or fixed ways of doing things in regard both to work and to worship"; the Spartan Greek on fortitude; the Athenian on beauty of all kinds; the Chinese on veneration; the Scholastic on pure knowledge; the American on integrity and justice. Socrates identified knowledge with moral virtue; perceiving the need of something more, Aristotle demanded habituation through exercise; many mediaeval philosophers regarded the will as the only essential factor in virtue, which reflects character, holding that knowledge fosters a questioning spirit hostile to authoritative moral law; and, later still, others argued that the emotions rather than intelligence are the central element in character. Contemporary opinion, as stated by Dewey, is that the elements of character are knowledge, "discriminating judgment as to relative values, direct emotional susceptibility to values as presented in experience, and force in execution."

A study of the history of secondary education in all lands shows that there are always two tendencies operative: one to afford practical training, whether it lead to skillful hunting, effective war, superior social life, or the acquiring of power to be directed toward specific desired ends; and the other to afford culture. This latter tendency, highly laudable in itself, is powerfully affected by tradition and foreign influence. In consequence we find means that have been satisfactory in one age or nation persisting or transferred wholly or in part to another, where they may be to a large extent insufficient. Education in the renaissance was appropriate to the needs of that time so that it laid the foundation for modern civilization, but it does not follow that a study now of Aristotle's physics, for instance, is the most suit-

*Read by Principal Howard Dutch, Montclair (N. J.) High School.

able means of preparing a boy or girl for the fullest life in America today.

Inasmuch, then, as character is a term defined not absolutely for all peoples in all ages, but, rather, relatively according to the demands of ideal life in the civilization of a particular nation at a particular time, it follows that we can satisfactorily discuss the problem of character-teaching in our secondary schools only after we have clearly perceived the elements that are essential in the ideal American of today. What these elements are, no individual may with entire confidence arbitrarily say. There will be little or no dissent, I take it, if among other elements we list a passion for justice, a broad conception of personal liberty, a love of truth and a lively sense of obligation to social service; but if any individual attempts to present a complete analysis of desirable character, he assuredly will fail, for the task requires wide knowledge, even omniscience, and more wisdom than is vouchsafed to any one man. And yet, *me iudice*, there is nothing more needed to promote the teaching of character that is effective in our contemporary American society than an attempt to make such an analysis and definition. After many a search for a study of this kind I have found nothing satisfactory, either from individuals or from groups. We can propose nothing that may afford a better foundation for the improvement of secondary education than the formulation by a group of philosophers, using the term in its broadest sense, of a complete statement of the qualities that are essential and desirable in American character today. Whether accepted wholly or in part, such a statement would afford a touchstone to which we should repeatedly turn when reorganizing our schools, developing curricula or courses of study, and improving the methods of instruction.

The importance of such an analytic statement is based on the postulate that ends, both remote and immediate, are likely to be achieved in proportion as they are clearly perceived and ardently desired. That educational ends are not always clearly seen today may be ascertained by any persistent questioner of teachers and administrators. The majority of teachers are satisfied to know that the earth is supported on the shoulders of Atlas; the more intelligent and consecrated go on to consider the tortoise on which the Titan stands; but what supports the tortoise? This question

is not intended to discredit those who with small or with great skill impart knowledge as organized, or even those who go as far as individual men may in seeking deeper principles for reorganizing the knowledge ordinarily taught and for supplementing it; they have all contributed, many of them greatly, to the miracle of modern American secondary education. The question is intended rather to direct the attention of the leaders to the necessity of a fundamental conception of current American ideals that will give meaning and motive to every educational problem that may arise.

That character is developed in our secondary schools is too obvious to admit of argument. If we were convinced today that it is not, tomorrow would see an exodus from the schools of the great majority of the best teachers and administrators. Altruistic youth demands, though often without conscious analysis, the opportunity to contribute to the betterment of mankind; wise age is satisfied with nothing else. A great teacher and leader of men has written: "Assuredly no thoughtful man ever came to the end of his life, and had time and a little space of calm from which to look back upon it, who did not know and acknowledge that it was what he had done unselfishly and for others, and nothing else, that satisfied him, in the retrospect, and made him feel he had played the man." And true teachers, it seems to me, more than almost any other class of men, find their impelling motive in this desire to aid unselfishly in the upbuilding of the character of the young.

My first point, then, is that in order to make the school-master's task of character-building more intelligent, we should have made by our wisest students of American life a clear statement of the elements of character that are most desirable in our civilization.

Until the desired analysis and composite definition of character ideals are made, each teacher must work toward the goal as he sees it, forcing himself to make on the basis of his wisdom and of such philosophic treatments as we have as definite a statement as possible of what it is that he seeks to do; and in order that the contribution of altruistic service may be most effective, he must consider carefully and repeatedly the instruments that he uses in his work. They are, for the most part, three: subject-matter, methods of instruction and personal influence. It must be noted that not only are these three instruments closely articulate

and often inseparable, but that they are operative outside the classroom routine as well as in it. I do not minimize the discipline that may be had from doing the disagreeable, from assiduity, from regularity, and the like in the studying and reciting of academic subjects; but as this field has been frequently emphasized in such meetings as this, I wish to turn your attention for a few moments to the less conventional but equally important extra-curricular activities. These may include all personal contacts between teacher and pupils as well as personal relations among pupils themselves.

It is generally agreed, I take it, that the most economical way of learning is by intelligently doing under wise guidance that which one is to learn to do. That there is occasional dissent, however, is evidenced by such remarks as the following, which was recorded within the week: "Oh, no," said a high school teacher, "our girls are too young for responsibilities regarding their conduct." The assumption in her mind apparently was that the girls are not daily making many conduct-decisions outside the school, that they will at graduation miraculously receive an aggregation of power, or that the school has no concern with such matters. Each of these assumptions, I hold, is entirely contrary to fact. My analysis of character-ideals shows many desirable activities of life for which inadequate or no provisions are made in the class recitation as usually conducted. Illustrative of these are initiation, organization and co-operation. To forestall unnecessary and beclouding discussion, it is admitted at once that classroom teaching may, and often does, contribute, both directly and indirectly, to such character-elements as have just been cited and to others that are desired; but it is at the same time maintained that much more experience under wise guidance should be provided. The opportunity is afforded in extra-curricular activities.

The British public schools are often and rightly cited as potent in developing character. A study of their procedure, however, shows that much of their curricular content and most of their methods of instruction can contribute little directly to the desired ideals of character; therefore, we look to their extra-curricular procedure and find in it a careful organization and a persistent effort to inculcate knowledge, ideals and habits that are considered essential for the British gentleman. The boy is

sent early from his home to an institution which in every way possible impresses both on him and on the public at large that he is an individual set aside for a peculiar mission. By close contact with his teachers, by constant restrictions and stimuli of the system in which he is placed, and by an increasing consciousness of traditional ideals he not only learns how a British gentleman may and may not act, but he is also forced consistently to do or to refrain from doing according to accepted standards until his character is more or less formed. Civil, no less than martial, victories are won on the playing fields of Eton and Rugby. And yet it is the curricular content of Great Britain rather than the extra-curricular life of the secondary schools that we in America have most successfully copied.

Mark Hopkins on one end of his log had in the familiar illustration only one lad on the other; in the modern secondary schools the instructor has shrunk somewhat while the lad has divided and subdivided with a rapidity that puts bacteria to shame. If it is impossible for a departmental specialist who meets from one hundred to two hundred different pupils for only one period a day to find the opportunity, to say nothing of the strength and and spirit, for giving to each and every one of his sympathetic understanding and counsel, then we must look toward the wise guidance of individuals to do in groups those things that may prepare them better to solve the problems of a modern democratic society.

As there is no time for a discussion of adscititious school activities, I merely cite with approval real advisory systems, the socialized recitation, the "General Organizations," the elected school council, the social, academic and athletic clubs, and such organizations as the Boy and the Girl Scouts, which have proved of great popularity and help with children, especially from twelve to sixteen. These instruments should not be discredited because they have worked imperfectly somewhere or other; no one earnestly seeking a means for improving character-instruction will be satisfied with easy negative criticism. The one important question is: "May I find in any one or in all of these means an opportunity for more successfully guiding boys and girls toward acquiring by activity that leads to satisfying results the elements of desired character?" Unless I am entirely mistaken, these means

promise more at present in the developing of secondary education than do reforms in subject-matter or in methods of instruction.

My second point is that while using all of the means in the classroom, both direct and indirect, for developing character, we should more seriously and systematically undertake the promotion of character-teaching through the so-called extra-classroom activities. They should be as much a part of the regular work of the secondary school as are the academic or industrial subjects. Incidentally it may be remarked that the Handbook of the Boy Scouts of America will repay earnest study by every one interested in the development of character.

The third and final phase of this discussion proposes the question, "Can character be measured?" Of course. There is no question about the answer when the question is stated in that form; for as one pioneer wrote years ago, whenever a difference can be perceived it can be measured. The very perception is a measurements. As a matter of fact, we measure character every day of our lives: we say Williamson has a better character than Johnson, or Smithson has greatly improved in character since he has been in school. It gets us nowhere to shout, as one excited orator did at a meeting similar to this, "Can we measure mother love?" Solomon did that very thing some centuries ago.

A more helpful form of inquiry is, "How accurately can character be measured?" The answer to this question must be less dogmatic; this morning I can only present some of the obstacles and tell how workers have attempted to overcome them.

First of all, we may agree that it is impossible to measure anything that is not defined. Even if there were a technique accurately of measuring character, A, in using it, would measure something that is somewhat different from what B has in mind. Therefore, the first step in an improved measure of character is an analysis and subsequent definitions of the elements.

After definition, the amount of an element possessed by an individual may be roughly measured either by the judgment of competent judges or by the objective action of the individual being tested. The first method we find very commonly used: the principal of a school says that pupil M. N. has improved in honesty. This dictum is based on some subjective standard more or less definite to the judge, but practically meaningless to others until

they have considered many of this principal's judgments concerning many pupils whom they know somewhat intimately. However competent, then, the judge may be, his judgment is defective in that it is not meaningful to others who may be seeking information regarding the pupil's character. The dictum, especially if it is approved by other judges whom we consider competent, we may accept on faith; but as a result we are unable to explain even to ourselves how much of the character elements the pupil has.

This method is considerably improved when one or more competent judges state that pupil M. N. is in character, or in some specified character-trait like truthfulness, inferior to pupil O. P., equal to Q. R., and superior to S. T. The dicta are much more meaningful now, assuming that we know pupils O. P., Q. R. and S. T.; but the measurement is not entirely satisfactory, inasmuch as the standards are both actually and subjectively variable and as they do not proceed upward by known steps from a zero point. Nevertheless, this method is a real improvement and as such it should probably be used much more than it is.

The second type of measurement, which has the advantage of a large element of objectivity, uses as criteria the action of the individuals who are being tested. It being agreed, for instance, that a man considerate of others will not, like the Elephant's Child, scatter his banana skins and that, on the other hand, he will seek a means of making the shy stranger enjoy the party, we may record his actions under suitable circumstances and gain evidence that will convey real information when passed on to others who have accepted the standards that are used. Multiply these standards and take into consideration varying subjective factors—for instance, the subject may evince that he is considerate by a thoughtful act which *prevents* kindness to the shy stranger—and a method results that is valuable in measuring character so that others may understand the judgment. This method is commonly used, when one says, "U. V. is so truthful that he will not exaggerate even in telling a joke," or "W. X. is so dishonest that he'd steal pennies from a blind beggar."

If we agree that a person who tells a falsehood to shield himself from temporary embarrassment or minor penalty betrays a negative amount, which we may designate x , of Alpha character, that he who tells a falsehood because of careless dis-

regard for accuracy has zero amount (just not any, either positive or negative) of Alpha character, that he who tells an untruth because of a mistaken conception of a high motive has x amount, and that he who not only meticulously refrains from making a misstatement but also sedulously seeks to convey truth even though it bring him personal discomfort has $2x$ amount, then we have a scale. As unusual or as offensive as the idea may be to some when applied to the measurement of moral quality, it does afford a means objective, with steps of agreed value proceeding from a zero point. Although circumstances may make such a scale somewhat variable, it is much more stable than chance individual judgments can be.

To apply such a scale it is necessary to place each individual whose Alpha character it is desired to measure in a normal or even artificial situation as uniform as possible. Chance may bring this about. By way of illustration let us assume that a group of four boys are equally involved in some school mischief. Suspected, they are asked by a teacher to make independent written statements concerning their own and their fellows' participation in the escapade. Let us assume further that they have no scruples as to "tattling." A. presents the facts, but falsely states that he had no share in the culpable act; B. carelessly sets down inaccurate impressions, without verifying facts and without effort to exculpate himself; C. tells what happens, and assumes all the blame in order to shield his fellows, while D. goes to considerable trouble to secure and present facts which he knows will bring him punishment without heroism. Then, the scale being accepted, we are enabled to convey to others acquainted with it somewhat definite information when we state that A., B., C. and D. have $-x$, zero, x and $2x$ amounts respectively of Alpha character.

Such a scale has small value in ordinary school practice. It has been explained and illustrated chiefly to show that it is possible. It does have a use, however, in scientific studies which must be carried on in order to give us real information concerning the results of experimental work in character development. All of us, for instance, have our own opinions concerning the value of self-government schemes in schools; but unfortunately these opinions are often flatly contradictory. Such a scale as has been

explained may measure results so that we have knowledge that is more dependable than varying personal opinions.

In a noteworthy book soon to be published,* Dr. Paul Voelker, president of Olivet College, incorporates the results of a study of the trustworthiness of eleven groups of boys and girls. By a series of ingenious tests he finds that a group of boys who had Scout training for two years made the highest score, the others ranging downward to the lowest, which was made by another group of boys from homes and a school where little attention is given to improving them in the trait concerned. Some time later he gave the same groups a series of parallel tests and found that the originally superior group still led with the highest score, that another group who had had six months of Scout training made the next highest score, having made marked improvement, and that the central groups did no better than in the original tests. Such evidence goes far toward giving confidence that direct instruction and training will actually develop moral character in traits that are clearly conceived and systematically sought by means of an intelligent program.

Whether convinced by the few experimental studies or by the observation of the youth who have received moral training of various kinds, we probably are in general agreement that character can be taught or, rather, developed, and that there is no more important period for such development than adolescence, that period of marvelous change, adaptation to social conventions and formulation of life ideals. If attention to this phase of education has been important in normal times of the past, it will be doubly and trebly so during the next generation when the world is adjusting itself to new conditions, with new voices calling from all quarters of civilization, or of what once passed by that name. Even if we would, we dare not temporize, we dare not fail to use every means in our power and all our strength and wisdom to prepare for the new era young men and women with characters as sound, as true and as noble as it is possible to make them. This is our opportunity; this is our mission; and this is our obligation.

*The Function of Ideals and Attitudes in Social Education. Teachers' College Bureau of Publication.

DISCUSSION

HEADMASTER EUGENE R. SMITH, PARK SCHOOL, BALTIMORE.

It seems to me that we teachers are very likely to ignore the fact that children are born absolutely ignorant of all laws of social and moral behavior. It is so easy for us to assume that the child knows the right thing and doesn't do it simply out of meanness. As a matter of fact, the child is born into this world with self-preservation probably as his only really strong instinct, and that is a very selfish instinct. If that instinct is never changed and guided it means that that child will take what he wants always, and practically all crime, dishonesty, untruthfulness, is simply self-defense. Now, the education of the child to be a self-respecting and useful member of the community is simply teaching that child our community laws and moral laws, enforcing upon him the viewpoint and the needs of the community, and giving him experience in making decisions so that eventually he becomes one who will choose the right thing to do. That is not a secondary school problem, primarily; it starts at the kindergarten, and most of the harm is done at the very beginning when the child starts to school, at six years of age. I believe that it is only through a thorough understanding of that fact, the knowledge that from the very beginning we must teach the child what is right and why it is right, and by insistence on that through all of the child's development, that we can really train his mind.

One example will illustrate the point I make. I know of a child who insisted upon coming to his meals with dirty finger-nails. The parents were just as insistent that he should always clean his nails at mealtime, and day in and day out the battle waged. The child finally appeared to have gained the viewpoint, and then all of a sudden there was a relapse. The child began coming again with dirty finger-nails, and the parents discovered that once they had forgotten to say anything about it to the child and he had come to the table without cleaning his finger-nails, and, having done it once without reprimand, he did the thing again.

I wish now to describe one or two tests that we have adopted at Park School. Eight years ago when the school was formed we put into operation a very practical and a very simple system of

recording the teachers' judgments on certain characteristics outside of the school work itself. We founded this on some work that had been done at the Polytechnic Preparatory School, in Brooklyn, and modified it somewhat. The system was simply to have the teacher classify in terms of numbers 1, 2 and 3 a number of characteristics. The characteristics at the start were application, attention, carefulness, courtesy, neatness, obedience, perseverance, punctuality, self-control and general steadiness of character and conduct.

Despite its evident value, there proved to be several weaknesses about the scheme. Three divisions were too few, for all doubtful cases were thrown with the middle division. Also, the teachers had no common standards, or even a common language, for judging and discussing such characteristics. As a general administrative weakness, there was no complete, easily consulted, single record of everything known about a pupil. The characteristic record had to be considered in conjunction with a health card, a school work report, mental tests, standardized tests, etc.

Furthermore, the judging of younger children needed somewhat different treatment than that for older ones.

We have therefore developed a rather complete system of child study. For the pupils from the first through the sixth grades, blanks are used on which the teachers write in paragraph form their judgments of the analyzed characteristics of the pupils being studied.

From the fourth grade through the High School a card is used that takes up every side of the child, intelligence, physical condition, social and moral characteristics, those underlying the ability to do school work, results of standardized tests, general characteristics including aptitudes, weaknesses and home conditions.

In order to enable teachers to make these characteristics successfully, a five-point scale is used, and each number of each scale is defined. In this way all the teachers using the scales have a common understanding and can mark the pupil in such a way that anyone consulting the cards will know what the marks indicate. Our experiments already seem to show that teachers use these scales with a high degree of accuracy, and therefore are able really to measure moral and social characteristics.

As examples of the scales, I will give you the classifications for industry and for honesty:

INDUSTRY.

Class 1. Those who try to get as much as possible from the course, showing enough interest and initiative to investigate beyond the teacher's requirement.

Class 2. Those who conscientiously meet all requirements, both in giving attention and in doing assigned tasks.

Class 3. Those who have the general intention of conscientiously applying themselves to their studies, but fail often enough in carrying out this intention to force the teacher to take too much responsibility for work the pupil should do.

Class 4. Those who are decidedly irregular in their attention and application, so that the teacher must continually apply pressure.

Class 5. Those who will not, or cannot, hold their attention to their work. This may be shown in class, in project work or study, or in all.

HONESTY OR INTEGRITY.

Class 1. Those who are not only honest with property and in their school work, but are absolutely straightforward and truthful in all their relations.

Class 2. Those who are honest with property and in clearly defined situations, but may sometimes evade or excuse themselves of meeting an issue squarely.

Class 3. Those who are generally honest, but are still lacking in ability to make fine discriminations between honesty and dishonesty. They may sometimes strain a point in getting help in their work, or equivocate, or be careless of property rights in small things, such as pencils, paper, etc.

Class 4. Those whose ideas of honesty are less clear than in the higher classes, or whose sense of honor is less keen. They more easily yield to temptation, and are likely to be more ashamed of being caught than of the dishonesty itself.

Class 5. Those who are deliberately dishonest.

In case there are clearly defined differences between a child's honesty regarding property, school work and straightforwardness

and truthfulness, a double, or even triple, mark may be given. In that case the numbers would indicate in order the child's classification in these respects.

It is evident, I think, that while the marking is subjective, it is nevertheless founded on many objective elements, and with thoughtful teachers should be reasonably accurate.

MISS OLIVE ELY HART, South Philadelphia High School for Girls—It is significant that the discussion has been an attempt to evaluate our work in terms of morale and of character. I think you will all agree that we have looked rather deep into the souls of our girls and boys this morning.

Mrs. Cabot has suggested that our chief duty is to see our students from their side and in addition to try to have them see us a little from our side. There is one possibility in this direction which has been forced on our attention lately. It is true that fifty or sixty per cent. of the children whose needs we are trying to meet are of foreign parentage; nevertheless when I think of the heated discussions among the girls at college as to whether the fork should be held with the prongs down and in the left hand, or in the right hand with prongs up, and of a certain girl who was turned down by a fraternity because she ate her soup from the tip of the spoon, I am inclined to think that our children are not the only ones who are reaching out toward social adjustment through such channels.

Because we must believe that school should function truly in training boys and girls to live well, we have been forced to see that the problem of meeting life easily and without embarrassment must be met in the school. We have therefore made a very definite attempt to show the students what to do on occasions: how to act, how to get through the simpler social amenities. We have been trying in the English classes to let them say the things we have always taught them to write. Freshmen and Seniors alike have been eager to discuss what to do in various social and business relations. One girl said that she was just getting over the agony she had felt when she went to apply for a position. The man had told her he would engage her, and then she didn't know how to get out of the office. "There didn't seem to be anything to say."

We have found our contact with our students through this

avenue very suggestive. Their keen interest in such discussions, their delight in dramatizing critical situations, their zest in meeting real occasions have opened up rare channels of intercourse between them and us. Somehow or other, their faith in us is quickened when they see that we care about the very matters over which they are so often deeply concerned. This business of trying to be grown up is their all-absorbing thought. Our chief value lies in putting into their hands the means—gentle, simple ways of expressing the real selves which lie below the foolish dress and silly giggles.

We are at present at work on a little manual which will attempt to suggest in present-day terms, convention of behavior, which will serve in time of need, on being a guest, having a guest, at the table, in a restaurant, on the street cars, in railway stations, at theatre or concert, business etiquette. These are a few of the headings around which the booklet is being built.

Ways and means of getting the material over to the students are under equal consideration. For "manners are not idle, but the fruit of loyal nature and of noble mind."

Is it not possible that the closer contact established between teachers and pupils on the basis of such work will be an additional strength in our attempt to secure the more serious ethical control which we know is needed?

PRINCIPAL EUGENE C. ALDER, Adelphi Academy—I was told when asked to take part in this discussion that it was to be an experience gathering, and so whatever points I am going to try to bring out come simply from my own experience in my own little bailiwick and may differ a great deal from your own.

I have listened to the addresses this morning with the keenest interest, and have gotten a great deal of real good from them. Certainly we are all agreed that a secondary school education that is not based upon moral training, is more than no education at all; that such an education is unsafe for the individual and unsafe for the State. Where we may differ is in the method of attack.

Personally, I am not at all and never have been in favor of the direct method of teaching ethics to high school children. I believe that it is not wise to lead them into introspection at that time. What I do believe that we need, however, is far more opportunities than we have for habit-building in our high school,

and wonderful examples for our children to see and meet and become acquainted with. And, therefore, my first point is that the teacher is the keystone to the moral arch. I don't believe that the ethical tone of a school can rise higher than the moral strength of its headmaster and its teachers. I am reminded of a questionnaire that was sent to a hundred graduates of one of our colleges some years ago in which they were asked to name the greatest benefit they had received from their four years' work, and eighty-nine of them replied, "Contact with a great teacher." The late President Hyde, of Bowdoin, used to say that he considered his salary for the year more than earned if he added one great teacher to his staff each year, and I believe you will agree with me that he was right. It is such teachers and the standards that they set that are the best text-books in the world.

What we also need in our secondary schools today are opportunities for boys and girls to practice the fundamental qualities of character. May I illustrate that with just one example from an experience we had at the Adelphi? During the war I found our boys and girls changing quite materially in their ideas regarding service. They had been willing to work before, as far as they understood that word, to obey the rules of the school, but when the call of country came and they found that they could be used for Liberty bonds and thrift stamps and tin foil and magazines, a tremendous change came over them. They began to realize that they were assets of our government. Their worth assumed a patriotic side. They began to feel an obligation, and I frankly believe that for the first time they caught the true vision of what real citizenship is. We are trying our best at the Adelphi to keep up that spirit of service. We have adopted a free kindergarten in the Adelphi district. We sent out the children last summer to earn and save what they could and bring it back this fall. They brought in over five hundred dollars, and they are working right through the year to add to that sum.

I listened the other evening to Superintendent McAndrews, of New York City, who told us of other examples of this same kind. He spoke of a public school where on Thursday morning at 10 o'clock the children take baskets that they have made in their manual training department, and sharp sticks, and go out through the little town where they live and pick up all the paper that they

find and then come back to the school. He spoke of another case where the stores were all furnished with proper signs by the children in the manual training department; of another where they were growing trees in the school. As soon as each tree reached the proper height and size the city took hold of it, transplanted it, put an iron railing around it and a little sign on it, "This tree was started and is being cared for by John Jones, or Anna Smith, of Public School No. 39."

I believe that we can take that right over and carry it over into the other fields. Obedience, prompt attention to duty, perseverance, good workmanship, self-control—a school is seriously failing in its duty when these are not part of the curriculum itself; but the care of health, if it cannot be entirely taught in the hygiene classes, can be taught by a fine parent and teachers' association in close touch with the home. Clean play and team work can be best imparted through the athletic teams and contests, and through the debating club and other outside activities of that kind. Honesty, truthfulness, dependability can be imparted most successfully through an honor system that is carefully supervised by the school; while loyalty, patriotism, reverence are the great themes for the daily morning assemblies. I am a firm believer in the morning assembly as the leaven for the school day, in the sense of unity, that comes with all the students and teachers gathered together in the study of God's word. I mean real study, not the hit-and-miss method that is often used in the morning meeting; the prayer, the hymn, all have their place in creating habits of thought towards religious truth. The opportunities which these assemblies offer for the development of patriotism through the celebration of national holidays and the study of character by means of the biographies of the world's foremost men and women, for the public appearance of the students themselves and the teachers before the student body, are worth all the time and trouble they cost. These are examples of the habit-building opportunities which I hold to be the keys to our moral instruction in the secondary school work.

HEADMASTER RICHARD MOTT GUMMERE, William Penn Charter School*—I do not think that it is any easier to define school

*Read by Mr. Henry Dresser, William Penn Charter School.

morale or morals than it is to define loyalty to America. The Headmasters' Association last February, in New York, debated and endeavored to define Americanism, finally abandoning the attempt and leaving it to the subjective interpretation of patriotic educators. There are, however, two or three cardinal principles involved in maintaining a high standard in schools which have suffered from the recent tendency on the part of the public to spend too much money, to live rather neurotically, and to disregard the best elements in the tradition which has been handed down to them. This is exemplified in an overdose of movies and in evening motor rides.

In a boys' private school, and that is the only type of which I am competent to speak, the most important step in the right direction is to have the boys so organized that they feel the code and lead the way in carrying it out. All this sort of thing, as the overdoing of motion pictures and smoking among younger boys, will be at a minimum if the boys themselves make it unfashionable and contrary to school spirit. If there are no intra-mural or extra-mural fraternities, if the societies in the school are a reward for service to the school, if the scholastic honors are not on a lower plane in the student's estimation than the athletic honors, and if the Senior class works hand in hand with the faculty, there should be a high standard of morals. An urgent suggestion here to the parents is feasible. They should be advised to cut boys' allowances in half and keep them home more in the evenings.

Secondly, spiritual training should not be on a cut-and-dried basis, where boys go to sleep over religious exercises and lists of the prophets, and then feel themselves at liberty to counteract the penance which they have undergone. The Bible should be taught to boys under thirteen through the medium of stories, and should be carried as a by-product onto the playing fields, where square conduct in games should be emphasized, or the pleasure of nature-study as a communion with a higher power, though never described as such in so many words. I should like to see the older students reading scripture and scriptural literature in small voluntary groups, in many cases getting ready for a college examination, as recently outlined by Columbia University and accepted by some half-dozen other colleges. The Bible should cease to be aloof and unhuman; it should be read just as older people read poetry or

John Morley's *Recollections* or *The Education of Henry Adams*.

Everyone agrees that close personal touch of teachers with boys is the most vital of all, that the win-at-any-cost spirit in athletics should give place to a more social way of playing matches, and that the school faculty themselves should be optimistic and non-preaching, but advisory samples of the value of the highest moral standard. One need not be afraid of the world "idealism," though it has been somewhat abused of late.

Of all these general and probably inadequate suggestions, I should pin my faith to the first two concrete statements—that the school organizations should themselves exemplify and interpret the code of morals, and that the Bible should come down from the mountain top into the plains.

APPOINTMENT OF TEMPORARY COMMITTEES

On Audit.

Miss Carrie Mae Probst, Goucher College; Mr. Robert Anderson, Episcopal Academy.

On Nominations.

Mr. Wilson Farrand, Newark Academy, Chairman; Dean J. H. Latané, Johns Hopkins University; Mrs. Thomas W. Sidwell, Sidwell Friends' School; Dean Arthur H. Quinn, University of Pennsylvania; Mr. Eugene C. Alder, Adelphi Academy.

AFTERNOON SESSION**BUSINESS MEETING.****REPORT OF THE TREASURER.**

For the Year 1919-20, Ending November 26, 1920.

DEBIT.

Balance Dec. 6, 1919.....	\$860.51
Dues from two institutions for 1918-19.....	10.00
Dues from 205 institutions for 1919-20.....	1,025.00
Dues from one institution for 1920-21.....	5.00
Interest on deposits.....	19.87
	<hr/> \$1,920.38

CREDIT.

Expenses of Annual Conference, 1919.....	\$229.17
Printing	736.65
Salaries	150.00
Postage and Office Expenses.....	111.70
Travel of Officers and Executive Committee.	16.53
Expenses of Delegates to Conferences, etc....	95.68
Expenses of Committees and Commissions..	158.25
Dues	10.00
Refund dues paid twice by mistake.....	5.00
	<hr/> \$1,512.98

Leaving a balance in the hands of the Treasurer, November 26, 1920, of..... \$407.40
On deposit with the Girard Trust Company, Philadelphia.

Two institutions are in arrears for the dues of 1917-18, 1918-19 and 1919-20.

Seven institutions are in arrears for dues of 1918-19 and 1919-20.

Twelve institutions are in arrears for 1919-20 only.

In accordance with the By-Laws of the Association, institutions are automatically dropped from membership because of non-payment of dues for three consecutive years. The rule applies this year to Wenonah Military Academy, Wenonah, N. J., and the Yonkers High School, Yonkers, N. Y.

The Treasurer regrets that the number of institutions in arrears for 1919-20 exceeds that for 1918-19 by five, although equal care has been taken to write personal letters to the institutions in arrears, in addition to sending statements several times during the fiscal year.

STANLEY R. YARNALL,
Treasurer.

REPORT OF THE AUDITING COMMITTEE

We have examined the account and accompanying vouchers and find all to be correct as set forth, the balance in the hands of the Treasurer being \$407.40.

ROBERT ANDERSON,
CARRIE MAE PROBST,
Auditors.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

During the year 1920-21 the applications of 29 institutions for membership were passed upon favorably, and two schools which had previously been dropped from membership will be re-admitted upon settlement of their obligations to the Association. The following institutions are joining us at this time:

Colleges: Susquehanna University, Grove City College, Westminster College, St. Joseph's College, Elizabethtown College, Marywood College, Loyola College, Western Maryland College.

Private Schools: The Castle, Albany Academy, Friends' School (Brooklyn), Polytechnic Preparatory Country Day School, Mary Lyon School, Princeton Preparatory School, The Vail-Deane School, St. James' School, The Buffalo Seminary, The Shipley School, The Cutler School, Nazareth Hall Military Academy, Cathedral School of St. Mary, The Pennington School, Stevens School, St. Mary's Hall, Highland Hall, Kiskiminetas Springs School, St. Mary's School, Tower Hill School, Cascadilla School.

High School: Lock Haven (Pa.) High School.

The total membership now reaches a total of 240, distributed as follows:

Colleges and Universities.....	79
Normal Schools.....	4
High Schools.....	52
Private Schools.....	115

It is apparent from these figures that we are receiving comparatively little support from the public high schools, and the question of interesting these schools more extensively is one that may well be considered by next year's Executive Committee.

The Committee has appointed President Frederick Ferry as delegate to the Conference Committee on Standards; and announces the appointment of the following as its representatives on the College Entrance Examination Board:

MR. WILSON FARRAND,	Newark Academy
MR. STANLEY R. YARNALL,	Germantown Friends' School
MR. WALTER MARSH,	St. Paul's School
MR. EUGENE R. SMITH,	Park School
DR. RICHARD M. GUMMERE,	William Penn Charter School

We are glad to welcome Professor Harry Clark, of the University of Tennessee, and Secretary of the Commission on Accredited Schools, who comes to us as the fraternal delegate from the Southern Association.

Respectfully submitted,
 GEORGE WM. McCLELLAND,
 Secretary.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON ACCREDITED SCHOOLS.

The Committee on Accredited Schools received its instructions in the following motion passed by the Association one year ago:

"That a committee be appointed to study the advisability of steps being taken to determine definite standards for secondary schools and to prepare lists of accredited schools; this committee to report at the next annual meeting of the Association—first, as to the advisability of taking such steps; and, second,

if deemed advisable, as to the steps that should be taken."

The following were appointed members of the Committee: Headmaster William M. Irvine, Mercersburg Academy, Chairman; Professor George Gailey Chambers, University of Pennsylvania; Dean H. E. Hawkes, Columbia University; Principal Stanley R. Yarnall, Germantown Friends' School; Mr. A. D. Meredith, Assistant Commissioner of Education for New Jersey.

Later Mr. Meredith was appointed Commissioner of Education for the State of Connecticut, and, being outside the territory of our Association, resigned from the Committee. Professor Edward F. Buchner, of Johns Hopkins University, was appointed to fill the vacancy.

The Committee has had two meetings, one in Philadelphia and one in Baltimore. It has also been in correspondence with approximately sixty leading educators in our district. Of this number fifty-one are in favor of preparing a list of accredited schools, two are opposed and seven are non-committal or doubtful. It is probable that this proportion would have been maintained had all of the educators of the district been consulted.

The committee presents the following recommendations:

RESOLVED, THAT:

1. There shall be established, by the Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools of the Middle States and Maryland, a Commission on Secondary Schools.

RESOLVED, THAT:

2. This Commission shall consist of eight persons, made up as follows:

(a) The President and the Secretary of the Association *Ex-Officio*.

(b) Six members elected by the Association on the nomination of the Executive Committee, care being taken to give proper geographical and institutional distribution. The members elected by the Association shall serve for terms of three years, provided that the original six members representing the Association shall be appointed by the outgoing President of the Association, with the concurrence of the Executive Committee; two to be appointed for terms of one year each; a like number for two years, and a like number for three years.

RESOLVED, THAT:

3. The duties of the Commission shall be:

(a) To prepare a set of by-laws for the permanent operation of the Commission, and to recommend modifications of those by-laws from time to time.

(b) To prepare a set of standards for first-grade secondary schools, and to recommend modifications of those standards from time to time.

(c) To prepare and adopt one or more lists of schools in accordance with the approved sets of standards.

W. M. IRVINE,

Chairman.

Upon motion the recommendations of the Committee were unanimously adopted.

REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON HIGHER
INSTITUTIONS.

I wish to present at this time a report of progress on behalf of the Commission on the Accrediting of Higher Institutions, appointed by the Executive Committee in pursuance of action taken by this Association at its last meeting. It will be recalled that the constitution of the Commission provided for six members from colleges, three members from secondary schools, three members at large and the President and Secretary of this Association ex-officio, ex-officio members for this past year, of course, being Mr. Marsh and Professor McClelland.

The Commission has held three meetings, and at the first of these it discussed the procedure to be followed in administering the standards of the Association and instructed the Chairman to prepare a blank for the collection of information regarding colleges. At the second meeting, the blank was adopted, and information which had already been obtained from the New York State Educational Department and from the Bureau of Education, Washington, as a result of the studies which both of those organizations made regarding a large number of colleges in the territory of this Association was carefully considered, though no action was taken. The third meeting of the Commission was held on November 12 and considered all the information which had been collected up to date.

It had been the thought of the Commission to present at this time the names of those institutions from which adequate data had been received and which have been fully considered. On further consideration, it seemed that possibly injustice might be done to institutions whose cases had not been finally considered.

It is to be said further that there are several institutions which are at the present time undergoing reorganization, one or two are in the midst of campaigns for a larger endowment, and, while it is quite possible that some of those institutions might be found to have complied with all the standards of the Association by the end of this reorganization or by the end of their present campaigns, it would not be possible to put them on any list to be issued at this time; and this feeling on the part of several that injustice would be done by the issuance of a preliminary report at this time seemed to be so strong that out of deference to that feeling the Commission has decided not to give at this time the list of institutions which have been fully considered and which up to the present time have been found to be satisfactory from the standpoint of the standards of the Association.

ADAM LEROY JONES,
Chairman.

PROFESSOR JONES: If it is in order, Mr. Chairman, there are a few additional remarks which I should like to make regarding the standards. It seems to me that this is perhaps an opportunity to clear up certain misunderstandings.

THE PRESIDENT: Quite in order, sir.

PROFESSOR JONES: Some have felt that standards such as those adopted by the Association, standards such as are employed by most of the agencies which are interested in this question, are arbitrary and really do not reach the important things about a college. I suppose we should all agree that there are perhaps just three important things about any college. Has it a well-trained and effective teaching force? Has it a properly prepared student body held up to high standards in college? Has it the equipment which makes it possible for it with a well-trained faculty and with a properly selected student body, to do first-rate college work? So far as I am aware no way has yet been found to measure within any reasonable space of time the value of the education which any individual student may have received. Possibly such a way may

be found, but certainly no such discovery has been brought to the attention of the Commission of this Association. There are certain questions which we may ask with the purpose of finding out whether a college has a well-trained faculty, a well-selected student body and an equipment which will enable it to do first-rate work. The standards adopted by this Association, which are similar to the standards adopted by other bodies elsewhere, represent certain of the questions the answers to which have a bearing on these points.

It is perfectly true that a faculty, every member of which has been highly trained, may not be an effective faculty. On the other hand, I think everyone would agree that, other things being equal, a well-trained faculty is very much better than a poorly-trained faculty. It does not follow that because a college enforces strictly its entrance requirements that it has a first-rate student body, and it does not follow similarly that if it is lax in the enforcement of its entrance requirements that it may not do first-rate college work.

However, a college isn't something existing in a vacuum; it is a part of an educational system of which the secondary school is a part with equal rights, and when it is charged, whether justly or not, that colleges are competing with secondary schools for students who in the normal course of their education would be seniors in the secondary schools, we have a serious situation and one which needs to be looked into; the burden of proof is certainly on the college which does such things, if there be any such. Such charges have been made against colleges in the territory of this Association which are otherwise apparently fitted to do first-rate college work. They are matters which it is the duty of the Commission to follow up.

Sometimes the fact that so much emphasis is put on the matter of endowment is called into question. I was talking this morning with a college president who raised that question, and he reminded me of the story which was quoted by someone else this morning about Mark Hopkins and the student on the end of a log, and this president suggested that apparently what some of us wanted was a mahogany log.

It seems to me that the matter of endowment is a very serious matter because, while it is possible for a college of small en-

dowment and small resources to do college work, the claim that it is doing good college work is a matter which calls for an unusual amount of proof. The reasons are these: The college which is not well equipped financially, that has not an endowment or something equivalent to that, is obviously put to a disadvantage when it comes to the employment of effective teachers, or the holding in its employ of effective teachers, and the college whose financial margin is small is in an exceedingly difficult situation when it comes to separating from itself those students whose work is not what it should be. It is very much more difficult for a college which depends to a considerable extent upon the fees of its students to be rigorous in the enforcement of high standards than it is for a college which is relatively more independent in that particular.

It is quite true that the report adopted by this Association last year and the standards adopted were preceded by a statement to the effect that a college which does not fully come up to the standards in any one or more of these particulars may more than make good that deficiency in other ways, and that this applies to endowment. There are a good many colleges in the territory of this Association which are supported in whole or in part by religious denominations. There are some the members of whose teaching staff teach without salary. Those are all facts to be taken into account; but certainly, unless a college has from some source the "sinews of war," the chances are that it will not prosecute the war with the degree of thoroughness that it might otherwise employ.

NEW BUSINESS.

Dean Howard McClenahan moved to amend Article 6 of the Constitution by substituting the figures \$7.50 for \$5.00, the article as amended to read: "To defray the expenses of holding meetings of the Association, conducting the correspondence, printing, etc., the sum of \$7.50 shall be assessed upon each of the institutions represented in the Association, and any deficiency that may occur shall be provided for by special action of the Association."

The amendment was carried without a dissenting vote.

Upon motion of Professor Jones, Chairman of the Commission, the sum of \$25 was appropriated for the Commission on Higher Institutions to cover clerical expenses, and the treasurer

was authorized to pay the necessary expenses of members in attendance upon the meetings of the Commission.

Professor G. G. Chambers moved that the necessary expenses of the Commission on Secondary Schools, during the coming year, be defrayed by the Association. The motion was duly seconded, and, without discussion, carried unanimously.

President Ferry then moved the following resolution of appreciation, which was carried unanimously by a rising vote: "*Resolved*, That the thanks of the Association be given to Johns Hopkins University, and particularly to President Goodnow, for the attractive rooms provided for the meeting of the Thirty-fourth Annual Convention, and for the gracious hospitality so generously extended to us all on this occasion.

GENERAL TOPIC: WHAT ARE THE MINIMUM
STANDARDS TO BE DEMANDED BEFORE AD-
MITTING ITS GRADUATES TO THE
PROFESSIONAL SCHOOLS?

I. PRESIDENT FRANK GOODNOW, JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY: I must confess that I am so out of sympathy with educational classifications and standards generally that I have never acquainted myself with any degree of accuracy or in any detail with the various plans for standardization which have been adopted or which are being adopted. Indeed, I am rather surprised to find myself attempting to speak to you on this occasion with what certainly must be a good deal in the nature of the valve of ignorance.

I am reminded somewhat of a story I once heard of President Northrup, of the University of Minnesota. Someone met him on a train, as he was going to the inauguration of the president of a neighboring institution, and asked him where he was going. He said, "Oh, I am going to hear some first thoughts on education." I imagine that what I will have to say to you today will be something in the nature of "first thoughts" on this subject, thoughts which probably won't be your last thoughts and may not even be my last thoughts.

As I see it, we can look at this subject from two points of view; in the first place, from the point of view of the professional

school, and, in the second place, from the point of view of the college. The professional schools that I have been acquainted with are very distinctly utilitarian in character. They are looking forward to a rather narrow, special purpose. That is the best education that can be given for the particular profession for which they are preparing their students. They naturally insist pretty firmly upon certain things, which are all of them of interest in a way to the college, but which do not by any means exhaust the purposes of the college. As a result of the gradual development which has taken place within the last twenty-five years, a development which has taken place to a very great extent within my own experience, the college has been forced into the position of the preparatory school for the professional school.

The professional school is getting more and more to lay down certain requirements which must be fulfilled in order that not the graduates, mind you, but the students of a particular college may be received as candidates for a professional degree. I say students rather than graduates, because the general trend at the present time is through some means or another, through the combined course or through the junior college, for the man that is going into a professional school not to spend more than two or three years in the college, provided that the professional school that he desires to enter is not one of those rather special, peculiar, professional schools which insist upon the bachelor's degree as a requirement for entrance.

In this way the college has become in large measure a pre-professional school and has little to say about what shall be the requirements for entrance into the professional school.

Now, looking at the matter from the point of view of a professional school, I don't think a professional school is at all interested in whether the log is mahogany or not. I confess I rather have sympathy with Mr. Jones' college president who thought that this insistence on endowment or plant or equipment, etc., results in the demand that the log shall be of mahogany in order that the college be regarded as in good and regular standing. I don't think the professional school is interested in anything except the character of the work done. In our medical school, which has had a long experience in this matter, we have no accredited list of colleges at all, except such as has been derived from our own

experience as to what colleges do. We are in the fortunate position, as a number of other medical schools are also in this country, that we have a greater number of students applying than can get in. We limit our entering class, in fact all of our classes, to ninety, and we generally have very nearly two hundred applications for the first year in the medical school.

Now, how do we select? In the first place, we fix a time beyond which we won't receive applications; that is July 1. We have to get our list made up by that time, and those that want to come to our medical school understand that and get in their applications before that date. Then we have what might be called, what would be called by the Civil Service Commission, a non-assembled examination. We have records of the different colleges from which the applications have come. We know from our own experience that college A has not done as well as college B. College A, which hasn't done as well as college B, will be, therefore, put to one side for the time being. Then, inasmuch as what we want is satisfactory courses in chemistry, physics and biology, we have the applications accompanied by a letter from the professor in chemistry, physics or biology in the particular institution with regard to the particular candidate. The letter is not, under our system, permitted to be given to the man himself, but is sent to the dean of the medical school. A good deal is revealed by those letters. On the basis, therefore, of a scrutiny of the college from which the man comes, the judgment being determined by the work which that college has done, not by any arbitrary standards of endowment or salaries of professors or anything of that sort, and by a scrutiny of the individual candidate, we reach a conclusion with regard to his acceptance.

Now, I wonder whether some such method isn't very much better than this arbitrary, as it seems to be arbitrary, method of stating the requirements demanded of a college which is to send its students to a professional school in terms not of work done, but in terms of endowment, of time and of presumed capacity on the part of the faculty, based to a certain extent upon the amount of salary that they receive? Personally, these other methods don't appeal to me. I am afraid of them, particularly so far as the standards are stated in terms of time. I will admit I am somewhat ignorant on this subject, but I have seen a number of

definitions of a standard college, and I think the usual definition speaks of a standard college as a college that gives a four years' course. Now, why should you give a four years' course if a man can get through in three? We originally started this institution with a three years' course, and we ultimately departed from that; but if we should want to go back to a three years' course, then we wouldn't be a standard college. It seems to me the danger of institutions or associations of this sort endeavoring to state these standards in the terms in which they are ordinarily stated is that the first thing you know the Educational Department of the States—there are some representatives here—will on the assumption that that is the kind of thing we believe in, incorporate the system into law, and then you will find that your system of collegiate education gets to be in more or less of a crystallized condition where experimentation is extremely difficult.

These are some of the "first thoughts" that I have had with regard to this whole matter, and it seems to me that we are working the wrong way. I don't know whether it would be feasible to work around in some way or other so as to get your standards based on the work that has actually been done in the colleges rather than upon the work you think they ought to do, because they have a mahogany log or anything else. I have sometimes thought that the system that has been adopted in New York with regard to the examinations known as Regents examinations for the secondary schools could be applied here. It would cost something, of course, but it seems to me that is the way to get at the problem rather than through these arbitrary determinations.

Now, as I say, we are not troubled here particularly, and a good many professional schools would not be troubled in the same way that we are not troubled, on account of the fact that they have more applications than they can accommodate. I suppose it is necessary, particularly where entrance to the profession is dependent upon the passage of a State examination based upon a certain amount of preliminary training, that there must be something in the nature of a standard set up, but I wish that could be worked out along the line of the character of the work done, rather than work out the standards in the terms of time and so on that are generally characteristic of the methods that have been adopted.

We can look at this matter also from the point of view of the college. So far we have generally looked at it from the point of view of the professional school. I have been looking lately at the conditions in our undergraduate department. I find that fifty per cent., roughly speaking, of the men who are coming to us are going into engineering. They are not going to have more than two years in distinctly college work, and a good part of that college work is preparatory to their engineering courses—in fact, the engineering department of the University is forcing down further and further so far as it can the distinctly technical work, even into those first two years. There is also quite a large proportion of the men who are taking a pre-medical course.

I was looking over with the Dean the other day the conditions of those men. Our medical school has recently adopted a requirement of a year more in chemistry, so that in order that a man shall be able to go into our medical school in 1923 he must have had three years of chemistry, a year of physics and a year of biology. He must be able to read French and German, and he must have had two years of Latin somewhere in his school or college course. We found that if a man got his Latin in the preparatory school, if he had one language requirement provided for in the work of the preparatory school, if he was accepted here with one year of advanced chemistry, in order to carry out the requirements of the medical school a pre-medical student trying to enter a medical school at the end of two years will have just one hour a week during each of the two years which he may devote to the studies that are not distinctly special, technical, pre-medical.

The college is thus ceasing to be what it originally was, that is, an institution of liberal training, and it seems to me that if this tendency goes on as it is going on, the professional schools demanding more and more, and more and more rolling off of the work they used to do for themselves as pre-medical work, the college will soon become little more than a pre-professional school. I can remember perfectly well that when I first went to Columbia University the medical course at that time was two years; they had all their pre-medical work in those two years and the rest of the work in those two years. Now the medical course has gone up to four years, and they roll off the pre-medical work that they used to do on the college. The result is that the college is get-

ting to be merely the hand-maiden of the professional school, certainly so far as these first two years are concerned,—and I doubt very much whether you are going to be able to hold the great majority of college students who are going into a profession beyond the two years, provided the professional schools let them in. Now, the problem is, are you satisfied with that from the point of view of the college; are you willing that the college shall cease to be, as it is rapidly ceasing to be, an institution for liberal training, and is it going to devote itself in pretty nearly the same way that the professional school does to technical and specialized training? Unfortunately an ordinary professional school hasn't any interest in liberal studies at all, so that if a man doesn't get them in the college, he is not going to get it to any very great extent in the professional school. It seems to me from the point of view of the college that there is a minimum requirement of liberal studies that ought to be demanded of men going into a professional school which we do not require at the present time.

Columbia has started a very interesting experiment in putting into the Freshman year a course of five hours a week on contemporary civilization. I don't see whether they get it in if the men are going to the professional school at the end of the first two years, but they are trying to. If something of that sort could be done I think that it would tend to liberalize the education of these men who are going in the professional schools, and it seems to me that that is just as desirable a requirement as any of the others.

Now, these are some of my "first thoughts" on this subject. I might possibly be converted to the idea of the statement of the minimum requirements in the way they are generally regarded, but so far I must say that I regard them with supreme suspicion and fear. I hope that some method may be devised, in the first place, that will state these requirements in terms of work rather than in terms of time and endowment and so on; and in the second place that along with that work shall be a certain amount of liberal training as a necessary minimum requirement for entrance into the professional schools.

II. DEAN WILLIAM MIKELL, UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA LAW SCHOOL: In speaking to the topic to which I am as-

signed, "What Are the Minimum Standards to be Demanded of a College before Admitting Its Graduates to the Professional School?" I cannot claim to represent any consensus of opinion, much less of conviction among the law schools of the United States, for very few law schools require that a man be a graduate of a college before admitting him to the law school, and manifestly a law school admitting men who are not graduates is not in a position to make any demand of colleges as to their graduates.

To speak more definitely, only two law schools in the United States (or indeed in any English-speaking country), so far as I have been able to discover, require a college degree for admission of all candidates for their LL. B. degree; these are the Harvard Law School and the Law School of the University of Pennsylvania.

Many require two years of college work; a few three; and another few require four years of college work if the student enters from a college or university other than their own, but will admit a student from the academic department of their own university on the completion of his junior year under an arrangement by which the student obtains his A. B. degree on the completion of his year in the law school, thus counting one year of work towards two degrees.

Thus, it will be seen, the law schools of the country as a body are not in a position to make any very impressive demands on the colleges, as yet. However, the tendency in legal education, both as respects the work demanded of the law schools and the preparatory work demanded by the law schools, is distinctly forward.

There was a time not far in the past when no non-legal knowledge was demanded of a candidate for the bar, and even the tests of his knowledge of law were perfunctory, the prevailing idea being that if the applicant for the right to practice law was uneducated and knew no law, he would lose his cases, and soon his clients, and then soon perforce drop back into the fields of productive labor. In the meantime he would have the opportunity to exercise the inalienable right of equal opportunity that belongs to every "100 per cent. American." The fact that in the interim he might jeopardize the lives and fortunes of his fellow 100 per cent. Americans was either ignored or, with our undeveloped

social sense, excused with the plea that after all nobody need employ an ignorant lawyer. Now, however, it is very generally recognized that the public is an interested party and should be protected against the menace of ignorant practitioners; and that the state has a duty to see that those whom it licenses to practice law are at least reasonably qualified to look after the rights of those who seek their services. And so all the states with, I believe one exception, now require an applicant for admission to the bar to pass an examination in law, and an increasing number of states require a certain amount of preliminary general education. This requirement is, in general, the equivalent of a four-year high school course. The Association of American Law Schools, composing in its membership fifty of the most advanced law schools in the United States, requires of its members that they shall admit no student as a candidate for a degree who has not, at the time of admission, completed a four-year high school course, or such a course of preparation as would be accepted for admission to the State University or to the principal colleges and universities in the state which the law school is located. Still, notwithstanding this low standard, many law schools, as I have said, now require two or more years of college work as a prerequisite to admission, and the number of these is constantly increasing. It is this fact that I feel justifies me in speaking on this subject. The question for discussion, "What Are the Minimum Standards to be Demanded of a College Before Admitting its Graduates to the Professional School?" may be approached from several points of view. First, from the point of view of the standards adopted at the meeting of this Association last year, viz.: a consideration of the number of professors resident at the college, the number of volumes in the library, the number of units required for admissions of students, etc. Second, from the point of view of the subjects (courses) offered by a college, i. e., what courses may the law schools demand be taught in a college as a prerequisite to the admission of the students of such a college to the law school. Third, what *education* may the law schools demand that a college give to its students before accepting its graduates. On the question from the first point of view I do not feel competent to speak. I confess I do not know how many full professors and how large a library a college should have to

entitle it to rank as a college, or as a prerequisite to the admission of its students to the law school. Frankly, I think college A with fewer full professors and a smaller library than college B may educate its students better than college B.

While I believe that education does not necessarily depend on the number of volumes in the library or even the number of hours of required work, I do believe that it is necessary to the cause of education that some standard be adopted to which institutions be required to conform as a prerequisite to recognition as a college. What this standard, tested by a number of professors, and equipment should be I am prepared to leave to such a body as this. I certainly do not feel that those whose thought is given primarily to professional education are as competent as those whose field of labor is the college to pass on this question, though I might say that the standards adopted at the last meeting of this Association seem reasonable to me.

Second: The subject may be considered from the point of view of the number and variety of the courses offered to the college student, i. e., breadth of curriculum. I think I speak for law schools generally when I say that the teachers of law recognize that there are certain subjects that it is highly desirable that a prospective law student should study while in college. The conviction of law school teachers on this matter is expressed in a resolution of the Association of American Law Schools adopted in 1919 that prospective law students should take while in college the following subjects:

- English; Latin or Greek (2 years);
- German or French (2 years);
- Mathematics or a natural or physical science;
- History, including English and American Constitutional History;
- Experimental Psychology;
- Economics; Political Science; Sociology; Philosophy.

If instructors in various kinds of professional schools could together discuss this question of standards from this point of view, I have no doubt that they would agree that there were certain things that they had a right to demand of a college before admitting its students to their schools. I have mentioned the subjects that the Association of American Law Schools deem it im-

portant for a college to offer; of course, the medical schools would add other subjects important in the training of physicians, and the graduate schools of technology, subjects vital in technical training. The residuum of these subjects, after the elimination of the duplicates, would constitute the demand of the professional schools on the college so far as curriculum is concerned.

This expressed conviction of teachers of law is, in a manner, another way of demanding that a college, to be recognized as entitling its graduates to admission to a law school requiring a college degree for admission, should maintain a certain number of instructors, a certain number of volumes, etc., i. e., supposing the work of the college to be *bona fide*. In these days of specialization, it is difficult to conceive of a college doing *bona fide* work, teaching satisfactorily one ancient and one modern language; English, Mathematics, History, Psychology, Political Science, Economics, Sociology and Philosophy, with less than the eight professors provided for in the standards adopted by this Association in 1919, and without adequate library and laboratory facilities.

Personally, while I think this list of studies recommended by the Association of American Law Schools on the whole a good one, I regard it as good only because it is calculated to give a broad, general education. It contains studies calculated to train in exactness of thought, to stimulate the imagination, to train the reasoning powers and to furnish a background of knowledge useful particularly to the student of law and to give, if you please, culture.

These tests are, of course, all merely formal or arbitrary, but that is not a sufficient reason for rejecting them. In the nature of the case any test must be a formal one. The requirement of a college degree for admission to the professional school is itself a formal or arbitrary requirement in the same sense. No one could claim that the possession of a college degree was a guaranty that the possessor was qualified to pursue successfully the study of law. Annually from 5 to 10 per cent. even of college graduates fail to pass their first year law examinations, notwithstanding diligent work on their part in the law school. Conversely no teacher of law would claim that no student without a college degree, or even no student without any college training, was fitted to master legal problems. But legal educators do believe that on the whole stu-

dents with college training are better fitted to study and practice law than those without such training; and, therefore, when in a position to demand such training of their matriculates, demand it; and some of us, believing that the best preparation possible should be demanded, require a college degree.

The third view: what *education* may law schools demand that a college give its students is, of course, another matter, and a much more difficult demand to formulate. One need not say, among educators, that a college may have an imposing array of professors, an unrivaled library and laboratory facilities, hold classes every week in the year, pay its professors munificently (of course I am putting a hypothetical case), and yet not educate its students. It may impart to its students a large amount of information along one or many lines. It may train certain mental faculties of its students, and yet leave them uneducated.

Whether a college does or does not *educate* its students, in the sense of training all their mental faculties, and adding to their store of information in a broad field of knowledge, is, of course, the ideal test of the right of that college to demand that its students be admitted to law schools requiring a degree for admission. It is, however, unfortunately a test that can be applied only after the fact; only by a testing of its students after they have graduated.

It is just this testing that the professional schools do, and I believe I voice the opinion of law school instructors when I say that this test convinces them that recognized colleges, on the whole, meet the test so far as the informational and cultural fields are concerned, but fail to give their students the mental training and the ability to express their thoughts accurately and concisely that we have a right to demand. When I speak of mental training, I mean particularly the training of their reasoning powers.

It is just this training that is all-important to the law student and the lawyer; more important than all the information he can receive on economics, sociology and history; more immediately necessary than all the culture of all the ages. He cannot take his first steps in law, as it is taught in these days in first-class law schools, without the ability to marshal facts clearly, select the im-

portant from the unimportant one, pick unerringly the vital point in issue, and, with his premise clearly stated, argue clearly and logically to his conclusion.

The ability to do these things should be as much a prerequisite to his admission to the law school as ability to read English with facility should be a prerequisite to his admission to the secondary school or the college. The law school has a right to demand that the colleges whose graduates apply for admission give this indispensable training to its students. We do not find that the colleges do this. The consequence is that the law school which looks to find this necessary tool in the student's hand when he comes to it, finds it necessary to help him forge it after his arrival. Thus a not inconsiderable amount of time which should be spent by the law student and instructor on the work of the law school is spent by them on what we consider the work of the college. This is a very serious matter to the law schools, as the period of three years allotted us in which to teach law is already too short. The law schools are doing this work of the college, and doing it well. I believe if a law student should return to college after a year spent in the law school, the college instructor would be struck, as I am each year on meeting the second-year law class, with the really amazing growth of such student in his ability to reason closely, with his ability to work out new problems requiring clear thinking, his self-confidence, his dissatisfaction with formulae, his ability to get beneath the surface of language to the thought, or lack of thought there hidden, and his boldness in challenging the greatest legal authorities (including his professors) to make good their dicta by unimpeachable reasoning. You will forgive me making this criticism of the work of the college. I hear it voiced not only by instructors of law, but by the law student lately out of college. His criticism of the college is that there he is regarded as a receptacle in which to pour facts, which facts and theories he is expected to hand back to his instructors at quiz and examination time, and not as a reasoning being whose opinions are either sought or regarded as worth considering when tendered unsought.

A first-year law class, only a month in the law school, was amazed when one of their number, after a discussion in which

several views of law were expressed, having asked the instructor was *was* the law, received the reply, "That is the law that you can convince the class and me is the law." That is the attitude of the law instructor toward his class. Incidentally it is the attitude of the judges; and, incidentally, it is true. That is the law, that counsel can persuade the judge is the law.

I would not presume to suggest to college professors, but my law students think that college work would be more helpful if college professors on the whole would adopt toward their students the law school professor's point of view; if they would adopt the attitude that professor and student are only fellow-students, the one a little older than the other, exploring together for truth, and that the student can really aid the professor in the discovery.

III. PRESIDENT L. C. HUNT, ALBRIGHT COLLEGE—The invitation to speak on this subject came to me with the statement that I might care to take part in the discussion, representing a certain type of smaller college that in some respects, at least, does not satisfy the standards of the Commission. That statement suggests the purpose and scope of this paper.

Standardizing agencies for our educational institutions have been active for some time and have been productive of excellent results.

This Association in fixing standards to guide its members is seeking to conserve and advance the educational interests within the territory represented by it. In announcing its purpose to set standards it has expressed its desire to make these general enough to comprehend the small college in a country community and has recognized the fact that an institution falling before the desired standards in certain particulars may more than make good this lack by excellence in others.

We assume that the code of general standards is the result of accumulated experience. The principles announced for applying the standards are fair and satisfactory. The problem arises when these standards and principles are to be applied to the individual institution.

No institution should be refused a place on an accepted list before a full hearing has been given. A general questionnaire will not bring forth all the facts essential. The investigation

should be thorough and sympathetic and due consideration should be given to the accomplishments of the institution as shown in the records of its students who have left either upon graduation or before they had completed full courses. By their fruits ye shall know them. Colleges, large and small, are rated by their best product and not by their poorest. Graduates of these smaller colleges are in the front ranks of active life, side by side with the graduates of the larger and better-known institutions.

The Survey asked for by the Interchurch World Movement has placed at our disposal facts about the smaller colleges which had not been gathered in so large a way before. What is shown by this survey of one college may be assumed to be typical of the showing made by many of them.

Albright College reported 591 graduates at the time of that survey. Of this number, 116 were in the field of religion,

133 in the field of education,

46 in other professions,

215 in other occupations.

Of the 116 in the field of religion, 99 were ministers and others were missionaries. Of the 133 in the field of education, 1 was a college president, 16 were college or university professors, 17 were high school principals, 64 were high school teachers and 35 more were teachers or other educational workers.

Among institutions with which we found graduates of this college associated as professors were the University of Maine, University of Cincinnati, University of West Virginia, Ohio University, Temple University, Purdue University, Johns Hopkins University, the U. S. Geological Survey, University of Pittsburgh, the Horace Mann School. One hundred and five women graduates are home-makers. Of the 591 graduates it has been possible to locate but nine. Of this total all but three can be classified in some profession or occupation, and these three are not unemployed.

The classes in recent years have been larger and the number of graduates is increasing more rapidly. In estimating the number of students going into graduate and professional schools it must be borne in mind that quite a number of students in the

earlier years left college before graduation for the professional school, but took at least two years in the smaller college by way of preparation. The contribution to educational work by decades is suggestive of the widening influence in this field. From 1880 to 1890 there were 12; 1890 to 1900, 26; 1900 to 1910, 33; 1910 to 1920, 81.

In this group of smaller colleges are institutions which have maintained themselves for 25, 50, or more years. They have held their faculties together in spite of tempting offers which have come to individual members to go elsewhere. They have had the favorable recognition of the educational authorities of their own states. They have won the recognition of educational agencies and authorities outside of their own states. The Secretary of the Faculty of Albright College and the Dean of the College, each of whom has been associated with the work of the college for more than twenty-five years, say that, so far as they know, no student has gone from this college to a higher institution of learning and has failed to make good; and that a number of them have gained distinction because of the work they have done.

Some of these colleges had recently projected programs of extension, but were interrupted by the war in carrying them out. They are seeking to make readjustment as speedily as possible. Every one of them is needed, and needed at its best, to meet the educational emergency now before us. They should be carefully and sympathetically studied. If they are below in some standards but have been doing the type of work above indicated, every movement made by an association like this should aim to conserve what these colleges have been doing and seek to strengthen them in their efforts for greater efficiency. To deny them a place on an accepted list, at least tentatively, may impair their standing in places where that standing has already been won and work an injustice toward them.

The professors in these colleges are graduates of our best colleges. They have taught ten, fifteen, or more years. They had to make good as teachers or they could not have held their places. They are close to their students. They continue in teaching because they are in love with their work. They have been tried as men and are known to be sterling in character as well

as efficient as teachers. Shall these men be dismissed at a time when teachers are so greatly needed and be replaced by persons who, while perhaps professionally better trained, are at least untried? On the other hand, is it unfair to ask to what extent undergraduate work in the larger institutions is conducted by men carrying the higher degrees? Is not some of the work at least done there directed by persons with degrees no higher than those of the men in our smaller colleges, and with less experience?

The graduate institutions are so crowded today that they are turning from their doors many who are seeking to be admitted. Is it not better then to encourage and foster the work of these smaller colleges which, according to the records of their accomplishments, have been doing well the undergraduate work?

In some cases the increase of endowment and the material enlargement have had to move slowly. More time is required when sentiment must be created for these things in large groups, like Annual Conferences, or similar supporting bodies, than when the supporting groups are small. But when once the larger plan has been started it is almost sure of being carried to a successful issue. In addition, an educational propaganda has been conducted which has aroused and enlightened a large constituency. This by-product compensates in some measure for the longer time required to carry out the plan.

In view of these considerations, and others like them which we cannot now mention, we believe the following to be reasonable and desirable from the standpoint of the small college:—

Standards which have developed by accumulated experience, such as those proposed by this Association, should be set as a minimum; not, however, as hard and fast rules, but as a guide. While some of them because of their nature should be absolute, others, though desirable, may not be necessary.

The principles which have been announced by this Association for applying these standards are fair and satisfactory.

The accomplishments of a college as shown by the records of its graduates should have large weight in determining its standing.

In the case of institutions which have for years been doing efficient work, much care should be exercised in order to enable them to conserve what they have already gained; and, in this time

of unparalleled need in the educational field, to develop all their resources. Let nothing be done which will impair the standing which they have won. Recognize them on the basis of that which by their fruits they merit. Point out what they need to do, if in items which are essential they lack; and if they have real purpose give them sufficient time to meet any reasonable requirements in which they may be lacking.

GENERAL DISCUSSION.

President E. D. Warfield, of Wilson College, expressed his belief that a definition to be scientifically valuable should be arrived at by induction, and not through *a priori* considerations; that the way to proceed to the definition of a college would be to take all the colleges of this territory and study their work and their products, and from these results to form a definition of a college. He emphasized the fact that the great endowment we are craving for our institutions of learning is "that old endowment of brains and character." He urged the upholding of an educational ideal and standards that command the respect and the enthusiasm of the youth we teach; the realization that the service of training, cultivating, and inspiring youth cannot be measured by mere material standards. The colleges that have made the youth of the world into the manhood of today should be made the basis of measurement, and from what can be learned from these colleges, standards should be established, to which the future may be invited to conform.

Inquiring into the methods to be pursued in determining the list of higher institutions to be accredited was made by President Joseph H. Apple, of Hood College. He suggested a personal survey similar to that given by the State Department of Maryland, in order to determine the atmosphere or spirit of the college and the character of work done there from first-hand facts and information.

The delegate from the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, Professor Harry Clark, made a plea for the acceptance of minimum standards such as those adopted by this Association last year, claiming that the standardizing agencies were asking only for what is a decent minimum, with the hope

that every institution would go as far beyond that minimum as possible.

Assistant Commissioner Augustus S. Downing, of New York State, spoke at length upon the value to education of the steps that had been taken in the past to standardize the requirements for admission to the professions, particularly by New York, illustrating from the gradual increase in the demands made by the public upon those intending to practice medicine, law and dentistry, and showing that the raising of standards was really for the benefit of the public, and not merely for the professional schools.

=

—

A

A

A

A

A

A

A

A

A

A

E

E

E

E

E

E

E

E

E

E

E

E

E

E

E

E

E

E

E

E

E

E

E

E

E

E

E

E

E

E

E

LIST OF MEMBERS, 1920-1921

INSTITUTION	LOCATION	HEAD OF INSTITUTION
Adelphi Academy.....	Brooklyn, New York.	Eugene C. Alder
Adelphi College.....	Brooklyn, N. Y. (Clif- ton Pl. and Lafay- ette Ave.)	Frank D. Blodgett
Agnes Irwin School.....	Philadelphia (2011 Delancey Pl.)	Josephine A. Natt
Albany Academy.....	Albany, N. Y.	Islay F. McCormick
Albright College.....	Myerstown, Pa.	L. Clarence Hunt
Alcun Preparatory School..	New York City (11½ West 86th Street).	Grace H. Kupfer and Blanche Hirsch
Alfred University.....	Alfred, N. Y.	Boothe C. Davis, Ph.D.
Allegheny College.....	Meadville, Pa.	Fred. W. Hixson, D. D., LL. D.
Allentown Preparatory School.	Allentown, Pa.	Frank G. Sigman
Armstrong Manual Training School	Washington, D. C.	Arthur C. Neuman
Arnold School.....	Pittsburgh, Pa.	Charles W. Wilder
Baldwin School.....	Bryn Mawr, Pa.	Elizabeth F. Johnson
Baltimore City College.....	Baltimore, Md.	Wilbur F. Smith
Baltimore Polytechnic Institute	Baltimore, Md. (311 Courtland St.)	William R. King, U.S.N.
Barnard School for Boys.....	New York City (721 St. Nicholas Ave.) ..	William L. Hazen
Barnard School for Girls.....	New York City (421 W. 148th St.)	Wayland E. Stearns
Barringer High School.....	Newark, N. J.	Lucie Beard
Beard School.....	Orange, N. J.	May F. Bennett
Bennett School.....	Millbrook, N. Y.	Ina C. Atwood
Berkeley Institute.....	Brooklyn, N. Y. (185 Lincoln Place)	Lewis Dwight Ray, Ph.D.
Berkeley Irving School.....	New York City (309 W. 83d St.)	D. Fred Aungst
Bernardsville High School....	Bernardsville, N. J.	John M. Tuggey
Bethlehem Preparatory School	Bethlehem, Pa.	A. R. Grier
Birmingham School for Girls.	Birmingham, Pa.	John C. Sharpe
Blair Academy.....	Blairstown, N. J.	Col. Thompson D. Landon
Bordentown Military Institute.	Bordentown, N. J.	Arthur L. Jones
Boys' High School.....	Brooklyn, N. Y.	John H. Frizzell
Boys' High School.....	Reading, Pa.	George N. Northrop
Brearley School.....	New York City (60 East 61st St.)	M. Carey Thomas, Ph. D., LL.D.
Bryn Mawr College.....	Bryn Mawr, Pa.	Edith Hamilton
Bryn Mawr College.....	Baltimore, Md. (Cath- edral and Preston Sts.)	John H. Harris, D.D.
Bucknell University.....	Lewisburg, Pa.	L. Gertrude Angell
Buffalo Seminary.....	Buffalo, N. Y.	Milo F. McDonald
Bushwick High School.....	Brooklyn, N. Y. (400 Irving Ave.)	Clara S. Burrough
Camden High School.....	Camden, N. J.	Rev. M. J. Ahern, S. J.
Canisius College.....	Buffalo, N. Y.	A. M. Drummond
Cascadilla School.....	Ithaca, N. Y.	C. E. Mason (Miss)
Castle	Tarrytown, N. Y.	Miriam A. Bytel
Cathedral School of St. Mary.	Garden City, N. Y.	Rt. Rev. Thomas J. Shahan, D.D.
Catholic University of America	Washington, D. C.	Dr. Robert J. Trevorrow
Centenary Collegiate Institute.	Hackettstown, N. J.	

*Members are requested to send the Secretary notice of any changes to be made in this list. The only degrees printed are those of the doctorate, in order to insure correct addressing.

INSTITUTION	LOCATION	HEAD OF INSTITUTION
Central Commercial & Manual Training High School.....	Newark, N. J.....	William Wiener
Central High School.....	Harrisburg, Pa.....	Walter E. Severance
Central High School.....	Philadelphia (Broad and Green Sts.)...	John L. Haney, Ph.D.
(Miss) Candor's School.....	New York City.....	Valentine Chandor
(Miss) Chapin's School.....	New York City (32 E. 57th St.).....	M. C. Fairfax
Chester High School.....	Chester, Pa.....	G. W. Gulden
Chestnut Hill Academy.....	Chestnut Hill, Pa....	James L. Patterson
Colgate University.....	Hamilton, N. Y.....	Elmer Burritt Bryan, LL.D.
College for Women	Allentown, Pa.....	William F. Curtis
College of the City of New York	New York City.....	Sydney Edward Mezes, Ph.D., LL.D.
College of New Rochelle.....	New Rochelle, N. Y..	Rev. Mother Ignatius
College of Saint Elizabeth.....	Convent, N. J.....	Sister Mary Pauline
Collegiate School.....	New York City (241 W. 77th St.).....	Arthur F. Warren
Columbia Grammar School....	New York City (34-36th E. 51st St.)...	Benjamin Howell Campbell
Columbia High School.....	Columbia, Pa.....	Mary Y. Welsh
Columbia University.....	New York City.....	Nicholas Murray Butler, LL.D.
Cornell University.....	Ithaca, N. Y.....	J. G. Schurman, LL.D
Cutler School.....	New York City (755 Madison Ave.)....	Henry L. Harrison
Dearborn-Morgan School....	Orange, N. J.....	A. M. Aroline
Delaware College.....	Newark, Del.....	
DeWitt Clinton High School..	New York City (59th St. and 10th Ave.)..	Francis H. J. Paul
Dickinson College.....	Carlisle, Pa.....	James H. Morgan, Ph.D.
Dickinson Seminary.....	Williamsport, Pa....	Benj. C. Conner, D.D.
(Mrs.) Dow's School.....	Briarcliff Manor, N.Y.	Edith C. Hartman
Dunbar High School.....	Washington, D. C...	
Drew Seminary.....	Carmel, N. Y.....	Rev. Clarence P. McClelland
Drexel Institute.....	Philadelphia, Pa....	Hollis Godfrey, Sc.D.
D'Youville College.....	Buffalo, N. Y.....	Sister Mary Ursula
East High School.....	Rochester, N. Y.....	William Betz
Eastern District High School..	Brooklyn, N. Y. (Murray Ave. and Keep St.).....	William T. Vlymen, Ph.D.
Eastern High School.....	Baltimore, Md.....	Dr. E. J. Becker
Easton High School.....	Easton, Pa.....	W. C. Davis
East Orange High School....	East Orange, N. J...	Ralph E. Files
Elizabethtown College.....	Elizabethtown, Pa....	J. G. Meyer
Emma Willard School.....	Troy, N. Y.....	Eliza Kellas, Ph.D.
Episcopal Academy.....	Philadelphia, Pa....	Robert Anderson
Erasmus Hall High School...	Brooklyn, N. Y.....	J. H. Low
Ethical Culture School.....	New York City (Central Park West and 63rd St.).....	Franklin C. Lewis
Evander Childs High School..	New York City (Westchester and St. Lawrence Ave.)	Gilbert S. Blakely
Franklin & Marshall Academy.	Lancaster, Pa.....	E. M. Hartman
Franklin & Marshall College..	Lancaster, Pa.....	Henry Harbaugh Apple, D.D., LL.D.
Franklin School.....	New York City (18-20 W. 89th St.)...	Friedrich Otto Koenig, J.N.D.
Friends' Central High School.	Philadelphia, Pa. (15th and Race Sts.)	Charles B. Walsk

INSTITUTION	LOCATION	HEAD OF INSTITUTION
Friends' School.....	Baltimore, Md.....	E. C. Wilson
Friends' School.....	Brooklyn, N. Y. (112 Schermerhom St.)	Guy W. Chipman
Friends' School.....	Wilmington, Del.....	Herschel A. Norris
Friends' Select School.....	Philadelphia, Pa. (140 N. 16th St.).....	Walter W. Haviland
Friends' Seminary.....	New York City (226 E 16th St.).....	John L. Carves
Gallaudet College.....	Washington, D. C....	Percival Hall
Geneva College.....	Beaver Falls, Pa....	Dr. R. H. Martin
George School.....	George School, Pa....	George A. Walton
Georgetown College.....	Washington, D. C....	Rev. A. J. Donlon
George Washington University	Washington, D. C....	Charles H. Stockton, LL.D.
Germantown Academy.....	Philadelphia, Pa....	Samuel E. Osbourne
Germantown Friends' School.	Germantown, Phila..	Stanley R. Yarnall
Germantown High School....	Philadelphia, Pa....	Harry F. Keller, Ph.D., Sc.D.
Gilman Country School.....	Roland Park, Md....	L. Wardlaw Miles
Girls' High School.....	Brooklyn, N. Y.....	W. F. Felter, Ph.D.
Goucher College.....	Baltimore, Md.....	William Wesley Guth, Ph.D.
Grove City College.....	Grove City, Pa.....	Weir C. Ketler
Gunston Hall.....	Washington, D. C. (1906 Florida Ave.)	Mrs. Beverly R. Mason
Hackensack High School.....	Hackensack, N. J....	George L. Bennett
Halstead School.....	Yonkers, Y. Y.....	Mary S. Jenkins
Hamilton College.....	Clinton, N. Y.....	Frederick C. Ferry
Haverford College.....	Haverford, Pa.....	William W. Comfort, Ph.D.
Haverford School.....	Haverford, Pa.....	E. M. Wilson
Highland Hall.....	Hollidaysburg, Pa...	Ellen C. Keates
Hill School.....	Pottstown, Pa.....	Dwight R. Meigs
(Miss) Hill's School for Girls	Philadelphia, Pa. (1808 Spruce St.)..	Lillian C. Jones and Agnes B. Austin
Hobart College.....	Geneva, N. Y.....	Lyman P. Powell
Holman School for Girls.....	Philadelphia, Pa. (2204 Walnut St.)..	Elizabeth W. Braley
Holton Arms School.....	Washington, D. C. (2125 S St.).....	Mrs. Jessie M. Holton
Hood College.....	Frederick, Md.....	Joseph H. Apple, Ph.D.
Horace Mann School for Boys	Fieldston, New York City (W. 246th St.)	Charles C. Tillinghast
Horace Mann School.....	New York City (120th St. and Broadway)	Henry C. Pearson
Howard University.....	Washington, D. C....	Stephen M. Newman
Hunter College of the City of N. Y.....	New York City (Park Ave. and 68th St.)	George S. Davis, Ph.D.
Jacobi School.....	New York City (158 W. 80th St.).....	Mary E. Calhoun
Jamaica High School.....	Jamaica, New York City	Charles H. Vosburgh
Johns Hopkins University....	Baltimore, Md.....	Frank J. Goodnow, LL.D.
Juniata College.....	Huntingdon, Pa.....	I. Harvey Brumbaugh, Ph.D.
Kensington High School for Girls	Philadelphia, Pa....	Beulah Fenimore
Kent Place School.....	Summit, N. J.....	Mrs. Sarah Woodman Paul
Kiskiminetas Springs School..	Saltsburg, Pa.....	A. W. Wilson
Lafayette College.....	Easton, Pa.....	John Henry MacCracken, Ph.D., LL.D.
La Salle College.....	Philadelphia, Pa....	Rev. Brother Richard
Lawrenceville School.....	Lawrenceville, N. J..	Walter A. Abbott
Lebanon Valley College	Annville, Pa.....	G. D. Gossard, D.D.

INSTITUTION	LOCATION	HEAD OF INSTITUTION
Lehigh University.....	S. Bethlehem, Pa.	Henry S. Drinker, LL.D.
Lincoln University.....	Lincoln University, Pa.	Rev. John B. Randall
Linden Hall Seminary.....	Lititz, Pa.	Rev. F. W. Stengel
Lock Haven High School.....	Lock Haven, Pa.	C. W. Hunt
Loyola College.....	Baltimore, Md.	Rev. Joseph A. McEueany, S.J.
Loyola School.....	New York City (65 E. 83rd St.).....	J. Havens Richards, S.J.
McDonogh School.....	McDonogh, Md.	M. H. Bowman, Jr.
Mackenzie School.....	Munroe, N. Y.	Rev. Jas. C. Mackenzie, Ph.D.
(Miss) Madeira's School.....	Washington, D. C. (1326 19th St.)....	Lucy Madeira Wing
Maher Preparatory School.....	Philadelphia, Pa. (115 S. 34th St.).....	John F. Maher
Manhattan College.....	New York City (3280 Broadway)	Brother Edward, F.S.C.
Manual Training High School.....	Brooklyn, N. Y.	Horace M. Snyder, Ph. D.
Maryland State Normal School.....	Baltimore, Md.	Henry S. West
Mary Lyon School.....	Swarthmore, Pa.	H. M. Crist
Marywood College.....	Scranton, Pa.	Mother M. Casimir
Massee Country School.....	Bronxville, N. Y.	Dr. W. W. Massee
(Misses) Masters' School.....	Dobbs Ferry, N. Y.	C. B. Masters
Mercersburg Academy.....	Mercersburg, Pa.	William Mann Irvine, Ph.D.
Milne High School.....	Albany, N. Y.	John M. Sayles
Mohegan Lake School.....	Mohegan, N. Y.	Albert E. Linder
Montclair Academy.....	Montclair, N. J.	John G. MacVicar
Montclair High School.....	Montclair, N. J.	H. W. Dutch
Moravian Seminary and Col- lege for Women.....	Bethlehem, Pa.	Rev. J. H. Clewell
Morris High School.....	New York City (Bos- ton Rd. & 166th St.)	Elmer E. Bogart
Morristown School.....	Morristown, N. J.	Arthur P. Butler
Mount Vernon Seminary.....	Washington, D. C.	(Miss) Adelia G. Hensley
Muhlenburg College.....	Allentown, Pa.	John A. W. Haas, D.D., LL.D.
Narberth High School.....	Narberth, Pa.	George H. Wilson
Nazareth Hall Military Acad- emy	Nazareth, Pa.	Rev. A. D. Thaeler
Newark Academy.....	Newark, N. J.	Wilson Farrand
New Jersey School for the Deaf	Trenton, N. J.	Mrs. J. Scott Anderson
New Jersey State Normal School	Trenton, N. J.	J. J. Savitz
New York Military Academy.....	Cornwall-on-Hudson, N. Y.	Sebastian C. Jones
New York State College for Teachers	Albany, N. Y.	Abraham R. Brubacker
New York University.....	New York City.....	Elmer Ellsworth Brown, Ph.D., LL.D.
Northeast High School for Boys	Philadelphia, Pa.	Dr. George F. Stradling
Ogontz School.....	Elkins Park, Pa.	Mrs. Abby A. Sutherland Brown
Packer Collegiate Institute...	Brooklyn, N. Y.	John H. Denbigh, Ph.D.
Park School.....	Baltimore, Md.	Eugene R. Smith
Passaic High School.....	Passaic, N. J.	Arthur D. Arnold
Paterson High School.....	Paterson, N. J.	Francis R. North
Peddie Institute.....	Hightstown, N. J.	Roger W. Swetland
Penn Hall School for Girls...	Chambersburg, Pa.	F. T. Magill
Pennington School for Boys...	Pennington, N. J.	F. H. Green
Pennsylvania College.....	Gettysburg, Pa.	W. A. Granville
Pennsylvania State College.....	State College, Pa.	F. E. Sparks, Ph.D.
Perkiomen Seminary.....	Pennsburg, Pa.	Rev. O. S. Kriebel

INSTITUTION	LOCATION	HEAD OF INSTITUTION
Phila. High School for Girls..	Philadelphia (17th & Spring Garden Sts.)	
Phila. Normal School for Girls	Philadelphia, Pa.....	J. Eugene Baker
Pingry School.....	Elizabeth, N. J.....	C. Mitchell Froelicher
Polytechnic Prep. Country Day School	Dyker Heights, Brooklyn, N. Y....	J. D. Allen
Princeton High School.....	Princeton, N. J.....	M. T. Vanderbilt (Miss)
Princeton Preparatory School..	Princeton, N. J.....	J. B. Fine
Princeton University.....	Princeton, N. J.....	John G. Hibben
Reading High School for Girls	Reading, Pa.....	Mary H. Mayer
Ridgefield Park High School..	Ridgefield Park, N. J.	A. Ray Palmer
Rutgers College.....	New Brunswick, N. J.	W. H. S. Demarest, D.D.
Rutgers Preparatory School...	New Brunswick, N. J.	William P. Kelly
St. Agatha.....	New York City (553 West End Ave.)...	Emma G. Sebring
St. Agnes' School.....	Albany, N. Y.....	Matilda Gray
St. James' School.....	Maryland	A. H. Onderdonk
St. John's College.....	Annapolis, Maryland.	Thomas Fell, LL.D.
St. John's College, Fortliam University	New York City.....	Rev. Edward P. Tivnan
St. John's College.....	Washington, D. C....	Brother D. Edward
St. John's School.....	Manlius, N. Y.....	William Verbeck
St. Joseph's College.....	Philadelphia, Pa (18th & Thompson Sts.)	Rev. C. F. Connor, S.J.
St. Lawrence University.....	Canton, N. Y.....	Frank A. Gallop
St. Luke's School.....	Wayne, Pa.....	Charles Henry Strout
St. Mary's Hall.....	Burlington, N. J.....	Rev. John Fearnley
St. Mary's School.....	Peekskill, N. Y.....	Sister Mary Antony
St. Stephen's College.....	Annandale, N. Y....	Rev. B. I. Bell, Ph.D.
St. Paul's School.....	Garden City, L. I...	Walter R. Marsh
Scarborough School.....	Scarborough-on-Hudson, N. Y.....	Wilford M. Aikin
Schuylkill Seminary.....	Reading, Pa.....	Warren F. Teel
Shady Side Academy.....	Pittsburgh, Pa. (5035 Castleman St.)....	H. A. Nomer
Shipley School.....	Bryn Mawr, Pa.....	Eleanor O. Brownell
Shippen School.....	Lancaster, Pa.....	Emily R. Underhill
Sidwells' Friends' School.....	Washington, D. C. (1809 I St.).....	Thomas W. Sidwell
S. Phila. High School for Girls	Philadelphia, Pa.....	Dr. L. W. Wilson
(Miss) Spence's School.....	New York City (30 W 55th St.).....	Clara B. Spence
Springside School.....	Chestnut Hill, Philadelphia, Pa.....	Miss C. S. Jones
State Normal School.....	West Chester, Pa...	Andrew T. Smith, Ph.D.
Staten Island Academy.....	New Brighton, N. Y.	Frank R. Page
Stevens Institute of Technology	Hoboken, N. J.....	Alexander C. Humphreys, LL. D.
Stevens School.....	Hoboken, N. J. (6th St. & Park Ave.)..	B. F. Carter
Swarthmore College.....	Swarthmore, Pa.....	Joseph Swain, LL. D.
Syracuse University.....	Syracuse, N. Y.....	Rev. Jas. Roscoe Day, S.T.D., LL. D.
Technical High School.....	Harrisburg, Pa.....	Charles B. Fager
Temple University.....	Philadelphia, Pa.....	Rev. R. H. Conwell
Thurston Preparatory School..	Pittsburgh, Pa. (Shady Ave.)	Alice M. Thurston
Tome School for Boys.....	Port Deposit, Md....	Dr. Murray Brush
Tower Hill School.....	Wilmington, Del....	John D. Skilton
Trinity School.....	New York City (147 W. 91st St.).....	Rev. Lawrence T. Cole, Ph. D., D.D.

INSTITUTION	LOCATION	HEAD OF INSTITUTION
Union College.....	Schenectady, N. Y....	Charles Alexander Richmond
University of Buffalo	Buffalo, N. Y. (Niagara Square)	Charles P. Norton
University of Maryland.....	Baltimore, Md.....	A. F. Woods
University of Pennsylvania....	Philadelphia, Pa.....	Dr. Josiah H. Penniman
University of Pittsburgh.....	Pittsburgh, Pa. (Grant Boulevard)	Samuel Black McCormick, D.D., LL. D.
University of Rochester.....	Rochester, N. Y.....	Rush Rhees, LL. D.
University of the State of New York	Albany, N. Y.....	
Ursinus College	Collegeville, Pa.....	George L. Omwake, Ph.D.
Vail-Deane School	Elizabeth, N. J.....	Laura A. Vail
Vassar College.....	Poughkeepsie, N. Y..	Henry Noble MacCracken, Ph.D., LL.D.
Wadleigh High School.....	New York City (114th St. & 7th Ave.)....	Stuart H. Rowe
Washington and Jefferson College	Washington, Pa.....	Frederick W. Hinit, Ph.D., D.D., LL.D.
Washington College.....	Chestertown, Md....	James W. Cain, LL. D.
Wells College.....	Aurora-on-Cayuga, N. Y.	Kerr D. MacMillan, Ph.D.
West Chester High School....	West Chester, Pa....	R. W. Reckard
Western High School.....	Baltimore, Md.....	David E. Weglein
Western High School.....	Washington, D. C....	Elmer S. Newton
Western Maryland College....	Westminster, Md....	Rev. A. N. Ward
West High School.....	Rochester, N. Y.....	William M. Bennett
Westminster College.....	New Wilmington, Pa.	Dr. W. Chas. Wallace
West Orange High School....	West Orange, N. J..	S. C. Strong
West Philadelphia High School for Boys.....	Philadelphia, Pa.....	C. C. Heyl
West Philadelphia High School for Girls.....	Philadelphia, Pa.....	Parke Schoch
Westtown School.....	Westtown, Pa.....	George L. Jones
Wilkes-Barre High School....	Wilkes-Barre, Pa....	J. P. Breidinger
William Penn Charter School.	Philadelphia, Pa.....	Richard M. Gummere, Ph.D.
William Penn High School for Girls	Philadelphia Pa. (15th & Wallace)...	Armand Gerson
Wilmington High School.....	Wilmington, Del....	A. H. Berlin
Wilson College.....	Chambersburg, Pa....	Ethelbert D. Warfield, LL.D.
Women's College of Delaware.	Newark, Del.....	Winifred J. Robinson
Xavier High School.....	New York City (30 W. 16th St.).....	Rev. Thomas White, S.J.
Yeates School.....	Lancaster, Pa.....	John H. Schwacke
York Collegiate Institute.....	York, Pa.....	Charles H. Ehrenfeld
Miss Ella Gordon Stuart ...	Gtn., Phila. (153 W. Walnut St.)	

DELEGATES REGISTERED, 1920.

- ADELPHI ACADEMY, *Brooklyn, N. Y.* C. Eugene Alder, Principal.
 ALBANY ACADEMY, *Albany, N. Y.* Islay F. McCormick, Head Master.
 ALBRIGHT COLLEGE, *Myerstown, Pa.* L. C. Hunt, President.
 ALFRED UNIVERSITY, *Alfred, N. Y.* Boothe C. Davis, President.
 BALTIMORE CITY COLLEGE, *Baltimore, Md.* P. Lewis Kaye.
 BENNETT SCHOOL, *Millbrook, N. Y.* Courtney Carroll.
 BIRMINGHAM SCHOOL, *Birmingham, Pa.* Preston S. Moulton, Head Master.
 BORDENTOWN MILITARY INSTITUTE, *Bordentown, N. J.* George W. Law,
 Head Master.
 BROOKLYN FRIENDS' SCHOOL, *Brooklyn, N. Y.* Guy W. Chipman, Principal.
 BRYN MAWR SCHOOL, *Bryn Mawr, Pa.* Margaret M. Law.
 BUCKNELL UNIVERSITY, *Lewisburg, Pa.* Llewellyn Phillips, Dean.
 CANISIUS COLLEGE, *Buffalo, N. Y.* Miles J. Omailia, S. J., Dean.
 CARNEGIE INSTITUTE, *Pittsburgh, Pa.* George F. Sheers.
 CATHEDRAL SCHOOL OF ST. MARY, *Garden City, N. Y.* Miss M. A. Bytel,
 Principal.
 CENTRAL HIGH SCHOOL, *Harrisburg, Pa.* Edith Philips, Dorothy Stillman.
 CENTRAL HIGH SCHOOL, *Philadelphia, Pa.* Lewis R. Harley.
 CENTRAL HIGH SCHOOL, *Washington, D. C.* A. W. Spenhorft.
 (MISS) CHANDOR'S SCHOOL, *New York City.* Miss V. L. Chandor, Head
 Mistress.
 CHESTER HIGH SCHOOL, *Chester, Pa.* J. Homer Rennie, Principal.
 COLLEGE OF NEW ROCHELLE, *New Rochelle, N. Y.* Sister M. Sephas, Mother
 W. Xavier.
 COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY, *New York City.* H. E. Hawkes, Adam Leroy Jones.
 COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY SCHOOL, *New York City.* W. T. Shepard, President.
 DELAWARE COLLEGE, *Newark, Del.* Edward Lawrence Smith, Dean; Arthur
 G. Wilkinson.
 DEWITT CLINTON HIGH SCHOOL, *New York City.* Ellen E. Garrigues.
 (MRS.) DOW'S SCHOOL, *Briarcliff Manor, N. Y.* Mrs. Ruth West Campbell.
 DREW SEMINARY FOR YOUNG WOMEN, *Carmel, N. Y.* Clarence P. McClel-
 land, President.
 EASTERN HIGH SCHOOL, *Baltimore, Md.* Ernest J. Becker, Principal.
 ELIZABETHTOWN COLLEGE, *Elizabethtown, Pa.* L. W. Leiter
 EPISCOPAL ACADEMY, *Philadelphia, Pa.* Robert Anderson, Acting Head
 Master.
 FORDHAM UNIVERSITY, *Fordham, N. Y.* M. Jessup, Dean.
 FRANKLIN AND MARSHALL ACADEMY, *Lancaster, Pa.* E. M. Hartman,
 Principal.
 FRIENDS' SCHOOL, *Baltimore, Md.* F. A. Kuller, Wm. S. Pine, Edward C.
 Wilson, Principal; Mrs. W. R. C. Ward, Isabel Woods, Wm. R. Flow-
 ers.
 FRIENDS' SELECT SCHOOL, *Philadelphia, Pa.* Lewis W. Cruikshank, E. V.
 Graefle, Walter W. Haviland, Principal; Leslie H. Meeks, E. Mae
 Myers, Eleanor Shane.

- FRIENDS' SELECT SCHOOL, *Media, Pa.* Anna Beitler Smedley, Principal.
- FRIENDS' SEMINARY, 226 E. 16th St., *New York City.* John L. Carver, Principal; Alice Smedley Palmer.
- GALLAUDET COLLEGE, *Washington, D. C.* Herbert E. Day, Percival Hall, Principal.
- GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY, *Washington, D. C.* John E. Grattan, Dean W. Coleman Nevils, Joseph T. O'Brien.
- GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY, *Washington, D. C.* Dean George N. Henning, Dean H. L. Hodgkins, Elmer L. Kayser, Dean W. C. Ruediger, Dean William Allen Wilbur.
- GERMANTOWN ACADEMY, *Philadelphia, Pa.* Samuel E. Osbourn, Head Master.
- GERMANTOWN FRIENDS' SCHOOL, *Philadelphia, Pa.* Rachel G. Calvert, Elisabeth T. Roberts, Stanley R. Yarnall, Principal.
- GILMAN COUNTRY SCHOOL, *Roland Park, Md.* Josiah Burtlett, L. Wardlaw Miles, Head Master.
- GOUCHER COLLEGE, *Baltimore, Md.* Clara L. Bacon, Dean Eugene N. Curtis, Herman L. Ebeling, Hans Froelicher, E. P. Kuhl, Eolla Lonn, Carrie Mae Probst, Agnes L. Rogers, Lillian Welsh.
- GROVE CITY COLLEGE, *Grove City, Pa.* Weir C. Ketler, President.
- HACKENSACK HIGH SCHOOL, *Hackensack, N. J.* E. T. Marlatt, Principal.
- HOLSTED SCHOOL, *Yonkers, N. Y.* Mary S. Jenkins.
- HAVERFORD COLLEGE, *Haverford, Pa.* Walter S. Hinchman.
- HAVERFORD SCHOOL, *Haverford, Pa.* Franklin A. Dakin, A. C. Tyler.
- HIGHLAND HALL, *Holidaysburg, Pa.* Ellen C. Keates, Principal.
- (MISS) HILL'S SCHOOL, *Philadelphia, Pa.* E. Alva Campbell.
- HILL SCHOOL, *Pottstown, Pa.* Francis F. Lavertu.
- HOLTON-ARMES SCHOOL, *Washington, D. C.* Mrs. F. A. Holton, Principal; Ruth Treadwell Osborne.
- HOOD COLLEGE, *Frederick, Md.* Joseph H. Apple, President; Anna Froehlich, Miss W. A. Lantz.
- HORACE MANN SCHOOL FOR BOYS, *New York City.* H. W. Martin, John D. Nirtz, Robert F. Payne, Charles C. Tillinghast, Principal.
- HUNTER COLLEGE OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK. Dorothea C. Hess, Lewis D. Hill, Miss Lao G. Simons, Evelyn Walker.
- HUNTER COLLEGE HIGH SCHOOL, *New York City.* Mabel W. Baxter, Marie G. Beirne, Jean F. Brown, Catherine P. Candler, Josephine Crocker, Doris W. Hering, Marion Alice Perkins, Grace M. Peters.
- JACOB SCHOOL, 158 West 80th St., *New York City.* Mary E. Calhoun, Principal.
- JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY, *Baltimore, Md.* Edward F. Buchner Ryland N. Dempster, John C. French, Dean John H. Latane, R. B. Roulston.
- JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL, *Washington, D. C.* Alice Deal, Principal; Betty Schragenheim.
- KENSINGTON HIGH SCHOOL, *Philadelphia, Pa.* Marion E. Potts, Harriet W. Sheppard.

- LAFAYETTE COLLEGE, *Easton, Pa.* William O. Allen, Dean Albert K. Heckel, James W. Hupper.
- LA SALLE COLLEGE, *Philadelphia, Pa.* Rev. Brother F. John, Brother Richard, President.
- LAWRENCEVILLE SCHOOL, *Lawrenceville, N. J.* Charles H. Breed.
- LEBANON VALLEY COLLEGE, *Annville, Pa.* G. D. Gossard, President; P. S. Wagner.
- LEHIGH UNIVERSITY, *Bethlehem, Pa.* F. R. Ashbaugh, Charles L. Thornburg.
- LINCOLN UNIVERSITY, *Lincoln University, Pa.* George Johnson, Dean W. L. Wright.
- LINDEN HALL SEMINARY, *Lititz, Pa.* Rev. F. W. Stengel, Principal.
- LOYOLA COLLEGE, *Baltimore, Md.* Rev. William F. Jordon, S.J.
- MACKENZIE SCHOOL, *Monroe, N. Y.* A. H. Fish.
- MANHATTAN COLLEGE, *New York City.* Brother Jasper, President, B. A. Michael.
- MARY LYON SCHOOL, *Swarthmore, Pa.* Mrs. H. M. Crist, Principal.
- MERCERSBURG ACADEMY, *Mercersburg, Pa.* William Mann Irvine, Head Master, W. A. McLaughlin, James Miller.
- MONTCLAIR HIGH SCHOOL, *Montclair, N. J.* H. W. Dutch, Principal; Howard F. Hart.
- MOORESTOWN FRIENDS' SCHOOL, *Moorestown, N. J.* Ruby Davis, Anne E. Maxfield.
- MORRIS HIGH SCHOOL, *New York City.* Fred C. White.
- MOUNT SAINT AGNES HIGH SCHOOL, *Mount Washington, Md.* Sister M. Placid, Sister M. Xavier Directress.
- MOUNT VERNON SEMINARY, *Washington, D. C.* Mary E. Colgan, Louise Hempstead, Mrs. Adelia G. Hensley, Headmistress; Harriet B. Walker.
- MOUNT VERNON COLLEGE, *210 W. Madison Street, Baltimore, Md.* Wyllys Rede, President.
- NAZARETH HALL MILITARY ACADEMY, *Nazareth, Pa.* A. D. Thaeler, Principal.
- NEWARK ACADEMY, *Newark, N. J.* Wilson Farrand, Head Master.
- NEW YORK UNIVERSITY, *University Heights, N. Y.* Casper J. Kraemer, Jr., P. L. Thorne, Homer A. Watt, Hugo C. M. Wendel.
- PACKER COLLEGIATE INSTITUTE, *Brooklyn, N. Y.* John H. Denbigh, Principal.
- PARK SCHOOL, *Baltimore, Md.* Francis M. Foelicher, Eugene Randolph Smith, Head Master.
- PATERSON HIGH SCHOOL, *Paterson, N. J.* Wordsworth D. Williams.
- PEDDIE INSTITUTE, *Hightstown, N. J.* R. W. Sweetland, Head Master.
- PENN HALL, *Chambersburg, Pa.* Helen Burn Zimmerman, Dean.
- PERKIOMEN SCHOOL, *Pennsburg, Pa.* I. R. Kraybill.
- PHILADELPHIA HIGH SCHOOL FOR GIRLS, *Philadelphia, Pa.* Anna Sensenig.
- PHILADELPHIA NORMAL SCHOOL, *Philadelphia, Pa.* Mary C. Peacock, Pauline W. Spencer, Grace E. Spiegle.

POLYTECHNIC PREPARATORY COUNTRY DAY SCHOOL, *Dyker Heights, Brooklyn, N. Y.* C. P. Scaboria.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY, *Princeton, N. J.* Dean Howard McClenahan.

ROCHESTER HIGH SCHOOL, *Rochester, N. Y.* Charles Holzwarth.

RUTGERS COLLEGE, *New Brunswick, N. J.* Charles H. Elliott.

RUTGERS PREPARATORY SCHOOL, *New Brunswick, N. J.* William P. Kelly, Head Master.

SAINT JAMES' SCHOOL, *Maryland.* A. H. Onderdonk, Head Master.

SAINT JOHN'S COLLEGE, *Annapolis, Md.* Sydney S. Handy, John B. Ripere, J. B. White.

SAINT JOHN'S COLLEGE, *Washington, D. C.* Brother Charles, Brother D. Edward, President.

SAINT LUKE'S SCHOOL, *Wayne, Pa.* Jesse E. Philips.

SAINT STEPHEN'S COLLEGE, *Annandale, N. Y.* I. F. Davidson, Dean; Clarence Russell Williams.

SAINT TIMOTHY'S SCHOOL, *Catonsville, Md.* Esther Perry Osborne.

SCHUYLKILL SEMINARY, *Reading, Pa.* W. F. Teel, President.

SIDWELLS' FRIENDS' SCHOOL, *Washington, D. C.* Mrs. Thos. W. Sidwell, Mr. Thos. W. Sidwell, Principals.

SOUTH PHILADELPHIA HIGH SCHOOL FOR GIRLS. Olive Ely Hart.

STATE NORMAL SCHOOL, *East Stroudsburg, Pa.* Helen B. Trimble.

STEVENS SCHOOL, *Hoboken, N. J.* B. F. Carter, Head Master.

SWARTHMORE COLLEGE, *Swarthmore, Pa.* Isabelle Bronk.

SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY, *Syracuse, N. Y.* William H. Melzter.

TEMPLE UNIVERSITY, *Philadelphia, Pa.* Dean, Laura H. Carnell; A. Calvin Frantz.

TOWER HILL SCHOOL, *Wilmington, Del.* John Davis Skilton, Head Master.

UNIVERSITY OF BUFFALO, *Buffalo, N. Y.* Julian Park, Dean.

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND, *Baltimore, Md.* Dean H. F. Cotterman; Neil E. Gordon, W. M. Hillegeist, Dean Thos. H. Spence.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA, *Philadelphia, Pa.* Geo. Gailey Chambers, J. P. Wickersham Crawford, Dean Arthur Hobson Quinn, George Wm. McClelland, Dean William Mikell.

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH, *Pittsburgh, Pa.* Frank H. Eckel, S. B. Linhart.

UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK, *Albany, N. Y.* Augustus S. Downing.

URSINUS COLLEGE, *Collegeville, Pa.* Dean W. A. Kline, Geo. L. Omwake, President.

VAIL-DEANE SCHOOL, *Elizabeth, N. J.* Adelaide Johnson, Laura A. Vail, Principal.

WADLEIGH HIGH SCHOOL, *New York City.* Melaine L. Rohrer.

WALTON SCHOOL, *Philadelphia, Pa.* Helen K. Yerkes, Principal.

WASHINGTON COLLEGE, *Chestertown, Md.* Clarence P. Gould, President.

WASHINGTON HIGH SCHOOL, *Washington, Pa.* Mrs. Mary D. Fitzgerald.

- WASHINGTON AND JEFFERSON COLLEGE, *Washington, Pa.* Dean R. B. English.
- WELLS COLLEGE, *Aurora, N. Y.* Kerr D. Macmillan, President.
- WEST CHESTER STATE NORMAL SCHOOL, *West Chester, Pa.* F. H. Starkey.
- WESTERN HIGH SCHOOL, *Baltimore, Md.* M. Theresa Dallery, David E. Weglein, Principal.
- WESTERN MARYLAND COLLEGE, *Westminster, Md.* A. M. Isanogle.
- WESTMINSTER COLLEGE, *New Wilmington, Pa.* W. Chas. Wallace, President.
- WEST ORANGE HIGH SCHOOL, *West Orange, N. J.* Frederick W. Reimherr, Principal.
- WEST PHILADELPHIA HIGH SCHOOL FOR GIRLS, *Philadelphia, Pa.* Gladys M. Adams, Mary C. Burchinal, Nellie P. Ferry.
- WESTTOWN SCHOOL, *Westtown, Pa.* Samuel H. Brown.
- WILLIAM PENN CHARTER SCHOOL, *Philadelphia, Pa.* Henry A. Dresser.
- WILLIAM PENN HIGH SCHOOL, *Philadelphia, Pa.* William F. Gray, Principal; Jonathan T. Rorer.
- WILSON COLLEGE, *Chambersburg, Pa.* Patty Gurd, E. D. Warfield, President.
- WOMEN'S COLLEGE OF DELAWARE, *Newark, Del.* Winifred J. Robinson, Dean.
- YALE UNIVERSITY, *New Haven, Conn.* F. B. Johnson.
- YORK COLLEGIATE INSTITUTE, *York, Pa.* H. B. Bertolet.
- FRIENDS' YEARLY MEETING SCHOOLS, *Philadelphia, Pa.* Mrs. Gertrude R. Sherer, Superintendent; Mrs. Ida Stabler, Executive Secretary of Education.
- U. S. BUREAU OF EDUCATION, *Washington, D. C.* George F. Zook.
- GINN F COMPANY. Ernest N. Stevens, F. C. Hodgdon, Roland L. Eaton.
- SCOTT, FORESMAN & COMPANY, *Chicago, Ill.* E. H. Scott, L. D. Crunkleton, Charles E. Keck.
- DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION, *Harrisburg, Pa.* W. D. Lewis, J. George Becht.
- DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, *Maryland.* Albert S. Cook, Superintendent.
- SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS, *Chester, Pa.* Chas. Wagner.
- ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS OF THE SOUTHERN STATES. Harry Clark, University of Tennessee.



